DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 628 64 FL 001 795

AUTHOR	Marvel, William W.
TITLE	Directions for the Future: Federal Programs in Education Designed to Improve International Understanding and Cooperation. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Education and World Affairs, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0859
PUB DATE	Mar 69
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080859-4409(014)
NOTE	172p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.70
DESCRIPTORS	Cross Cultural Training, *Cultural Exchange, Cultural Interrelationships, *Educational Programs, Federal Government, *Federal Programs, Foreign Culture, *Foreign Relations, *International Education, International Organizations, International Programs

ABSTRACT

The central focus of the report is on the changes, adjustments, and consolidation necessary to achieve national goals through international education. Recommendations pertaining to the federal agencies and activities in international education are presented as sets of options which seek to: (1) define the basis for evaluating the federal government's efforts in international education; (2) achieve greater efficiency in the use of high-level manpower and funds; (3) assure close agency linkage; (4) highlight the relevance of international education to the urgent domestic problems of American society; and (5) take account of sensitivities of peoples in less advanced countries. Shifting attention to long-range considerations, the report examines the problems of interagency coordination and balance of effort in international education, agency duplication and conflict in direction, and program articulation. The potential establishment of a new public-private agency to provide stimulation for the voluntary agencies in international affairs is considered. A comprehensive review of current and past programs is included with major relevant reports dating from 1949 through 1968. (Author/RL)

PRINTED BY THE STANDARD REGISTER COMPANY, U. S. A.
FORM 0801

BR 8-0859
PA 64

ED040628

FL001795

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-0859
Contract No. OEC-0-8-080859-4409 (014)

DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Federal Programs in Education Designed to Improve International Understanding and Cooperation

William W. Marvel, President
(Project Director)
Education and World Affairs
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10036

March, 1969

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ED040628

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-0859
Contract No. OEC-0-8-080859-4409(014)

DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE: Federal Programs in Education Designed to Improve International Understanding and Cooperation

William W. Marvel, President
(Project Director)
Education and World Affairs
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10036
March, 1969

Staff

From Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	From Education and World Affairs
Janice Johnson	Peter N. Gillingham
David Hohman	Joel L. Johnson
John Satorius	David B. Arnold
	Andre E. Rheault
	Patricia S. Huntington
	Margie M. Reinhart

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Contents

Page

Summary

I. Introduction 1

II. International Education in the National Interest: Meaning and Objectives 4

III. Past Accomplishments, Present Realities, and Future Needs 12

IV. Federal Programs in International Education 30

  A. Current Patterns: "Primary" and "Secondary" Agencies 30

  B. Major Issues 35

V. Options for the Short-Run 46

VI. Directions for the Longer-Run 61

Appendices

A. Conduct of the Study and Acknowledgements

B. Synopsis of Federal Agency Programs

C. Major Relevant Reports, 1949 - 1968: Approaches and Recommendations

DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Federal Programs in Education Designed to Improve International Understanding and Cooperation

Summary

I. INTRODUCTION

The central focus of the report is on the changes, adjustments, and consolidation necessary to achieve our national goals through international education more "efficiently and expeditiously." New arrangements are necessary: 1) to define the basis for evaluating the federal government's efforts in international education; 2) to achieve greater efficiency in the use of high-level manpower and funds; 3) to assure close agency linkage, interpenetration, and reinforcement between domestic and overseas aspects of international education; 4) to highlight the relevance of international education to the urgent domestic problems of American society; 5) and to take account of sensitivities of peoples in less advanced countries.

II. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST: Meaning and Objectives

International education is best pictured as a wide umbrella encompassing: research, development of trained manpower, achievement of national literacy in world affairs, educational and cultural exchanges, and educational cooperation with the less developed countries. As declared by Congress in the IEA, federal involvement in international education is closely tied to our national interest: to sustain a position of effective and compassionate world leadership, the United States must have a continuing flow of knowledge, and expanding resources of both specialized manpower and educated citizens; we must meet the responsibility which our wealth and advantages give us to share our experience and skills with less developed peoples. Other motivations including business, commercial, national security, and humanitarian interests also provide rationales for the support of international education. Yet, in attempting to "adjust and consolidate," this very complex of rationales impedes the process of both analysis and prescription. Moreover, dichotomies are inherent in international education: it takes place here and abroad; the flow of benefits is in both directions; motivations of both self-interest and altruism are simultaneously at work; it has been justified both in terms of foreign policy and in genuine educational terms; and finally it is an area of shared public and private effort.

III. PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS, PRESENT REALITIES AND FUTURE NEEDS

A. Past Accomplishments

Our accomplishments in the field of international education are a necessary backdrop for any future recommendations. The real accomplishments are not quantifiable; achievements are found in the realm of attitudes, ideas and intellectual growth. However, the picture of international education in the 30s provides an historical measure of accomplishment. The possibilities for world affairs education in the colleges and universities during the 30s -- reflecting the world role of the United States -- were parochial. Today, opportunities are available to build higher education around a wide selection of international relations courses and the study of other cultures.

Past progress is also reflected in the increased activity in international education in recent decades: 1. language and area studies have grown since the 1940s to 150 programs at 65 universities; 2. there has been a rapid growth of Americans working, teaching, and studying overseas, and correspondingly a heavy flow of foreign students coming to American campuses -- one of the major developments was the Fulbright program; 3. there has been a dramatic expansion of foreign language teaching at every level; 4. there has been a marked growth of undergraduate study programs abroad; 5. the university contract system for technical assistance was begun in the 50s; 6. the Peace Corps was begun in the early 60s; and 7. English language teaching has reached a large audience overseas.

B. Present Realities

The great variety of opportunities for learning helped to condition the mind of America to the world leadership position in which this country found itself after World War II. Today the American people must again make a quantum shift in their attitudes toward world affairs. We are living in a period of widely distributed power. Our ability to shape events is severely reduced -- events have become unmanageable resulting in a sense of malaise and frustration among Americans.

Recent trends cutting funds for support of what were traditionally considered positive and constructive programs in international affairs is symptomatic in part of this malaise. International education programs have shared the general fate of across-the-board cuts, especially in AID funding. A retreat from internationalism is but one of the problems besetting international education -- both the war in Vietnam and our racial and urban problems have drastically reduced available resources. The years 1965-68 witnessed escalation of the Vietnam problem during the months when efforts were being made to pass and fund the International Education Act. And the February 1967 exposure of covert funding of overseas programs by the CIA intensified the general feeling of unease among Americans with things international

C. Future Needs

In order to maintain world leadership: 1) the United States must move further toward full national literacy in world affairs. 2) While the universities are in a process of rethinking the relevance of their curriculum in answer to student dissent, they must exploit the potentialities of international studies. 3) We must meet the continuing need for highly trained people to staff international diplomatic, military, business, technical assistance and voluntary agency enterprises. 4) We must meet the need for objective criticism of the military-industrial complex. 5) And finally, a concerted effort must be made to link effectively our overseas research and development activities. The possibilities of exerting constructive influence in the world through cooperative educational and cultural channels is proportionately greater, not less, in this era when the "manageability of foreign affairs" is waning. There is also a strong prospect that assistance in solving urgent domestic problems can be found in experience accumulated through involvement in international activities.

IV. FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

A. Current Patterns: Primary and Secondary Agencies

Of the 34 agencies with responsibility for federal programs that have to do with educational activities aimed at international understanding and cooperation, 10 agencies were designated as having primary responsibility for international education programs by virtue of legislation and tradition. However, the active, although limited participation of secondary agencies may be just as relevant to a reformulated conception of international education as are the more conventional activities of the primary agencies -- the Department of State, USIA, AID, the Peace Corps; DOD, the CIA, OE, the Department of Agriculture, the National Science Foundation and the Smithsonian Institution.

B. Major Issues

There are several key matters which must be considered in making recommendations:

1) What will the new balance sheet look like -- what will the gains and losses be in the willingness of the Executive to request, and of Congress to approve, appropriations under any given new arrangement?

2) To what extent can the United States advance its own basic purposes through increased support of multilateral and international lending agencies?

3) How can this nation solve the multiple dilemmas presented by accumulations of U.S.-owned surplus foreign currencies in certain other countries and harness larger portions of these funds to constructive, international education efforts?

4) Given the American concept of democratic participation in foreign affairs and the fact that international education is an area where the role of private individuals and non-governmental institutions is central, how can we improve the structuring of public-private relationships?

5) To what extent should the inherent, natural relationships between the domestic and the overseas aspects of international education be reflected and reinforced in the assignment of roles and missions to the various federal agencies in this field?

6) Where should the balance be struck between the extensive pluralism we now have and the goal of greater concentration and coordination?

7) Finally, to what extent should the heavy involvement of the mission-oriented foreign affairs and military agencies in international education be superseded by other arrangements that would signalize the educational, rather than the foreign policy, meaning of these programs? This issue cannot be answered in general but rather calls for a careful consideration of each of the following agencies and its present responsibility:

1. State Department
2. AID
3. USIA
4. The Military Security Agencies
5. Defense Department*

V. OPTIONS FOR THE SHORT-RUN

Recommendations are presented in terms of three sets of options rather than as a single series of explicit proposals.

General Considerations

These options are based on certain general conclusions that were reached in the course of the study:

---

* The agencies are examined individually in the body of the report pp. 39-45.

a) The study staff encountered no general demand for a sweeping, total reorganization of agency responsibility.

b) The 24 "secondary" agencies have a role in international education, as do some of the mission oriented agencies on the "primary" list. The pattern of dispersion, with "pieces of the action" located in many different quarters, corresponds to the picture presented by the "hard" sciences. Their interests are represented in a variety of departments and agencies, and this is a fairly common phenomenon throughout the government.

Adjustment and Consolidation in the Short-Run

Here again our interest lies with the ten "primary" agencies -- especially those that have explicit international missions. Of these agencies, two will be omitted from the conclusions and recommendations: the CIA because its role as covert banker has been terminated; and the Peace Corps because it is sui generis. Some of the same considerations apply to the Department of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution -- agencies not among those with traditional international missions.

1. CU -- Relocation of responsibility for CU programs in international education should be undertaken with the following questions in mind: the inappropriateness of conducting CU's foundation-like action programs in a non-action-oriented department; the desirability of placing a layer of insulation between genuine educational activities and the conduct of American foreign policy on the diplomatic, political and military fronts; and the importance of finding a more suitable setting for these activities in order that constituency relationships with the American academic community can be more effectively developed. In addition, a way should be found to relate the Office of Overseas Schools to OE.

2. USIA -- USIA's activities might be greatly enhanced if they were placed under the aegis of the federal government's "education agency" rather than remaining with its "information arm."

3. AID -- If AID continues in roughly the same form, the question will not be the inappropriateness of AID's involvement in international education, but rather the gap left as a result of the very specific philosophy, operations and coverage of the foreign assistance program. For instance, attention will have to be given to AID-type educational relations with the more developed nations and with those universities outside the AID country plan. New arrangements are needed to support the placement of U.S. academic personnel in higher educational institutions abroad. With respect to AID itself, the emphasis should be on the refinement of concepts, programming and administration to assure effective performance, and the building of sound relationships with the

American academic community.

4. DOD -- Are the 8,500 or so "foreign students" who come to U.S. for military training being given a fully rounded educational experience? This question should be examined by a panel of Defens officials and civilian educators and men of affairs. But the more important problem is that of Defense sponsorship and funding of so science, especially foreign area field research by university sch The question is not whether Defense should be involved in social s research -- it should -- but how. The answer lies in several move 1) the coordinating mechanism of FAR should be strengthened to scr DOD field investigations; 2) ARPA should enforce strict quality cr for research projects it funds; 3) U. S. universities should try t sencitize their faculty members about the hazards of casual use of funds; 4) limitations could be set on the level of DOD funds, but if Congress will fill the gap with a multiple-funding-sources stra

5. OE -- This is the pivotal agency from the standpoint of fu planning, and should become the nation's "focal point of leadershi OE has manifested a traditional sense of responsibility for intern education and this is being continued through its new Institute of International Studies. However, before OE can function as the cent of consolidation for various federal activities in international ed it will have to be substantially strengthened. The following three options are based on an expanded role for OE. The essential meanin these options is that there is no other preferable and feasible mea of reform, except to base it on OE.

Option 1: Concentrate on improvement of individual federal pr in international education without any significant relocation of ac or establishment of new institutional arrangements.

Option 2: Undertake the moves embodied in Option 1 and, in addition, give concerted support to the strategy already embodied i the new Institute of International Studies for Office-of-Education- attention to international education, by using as many of the exist legislative authorities as possible.

Option 3: Further strengthen the Office of Education so that becomes not only a "focal point of leadership" for federal activiti in international education, but also a base to which certain highly relevant programs and functions could be transferred. (This sectio the report should be read in full because it contains the most sign cant recommendations.)

VI. DIRECTIONS FOR THE LONGER RUN

Two important matters remain for future consideration:

1) Interagency coordination - Greater coordination is necessary in order to maintain a "rolling balance" of effort in international education; to guard against unnecessary duplication and conflicting directions in agency efforts; and to achieve, not absolute symmetry and harmony, but a reasonable level of coherence. This report takes the view that the appropriate locus for such coordination might rest in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, provided that the requisite commitment and orientation can be assured.

2) A new "public-private" agency - Perhaps we should consider a new quasi-public instrumentality in view of the possibility that the changes proposed in Option 3 will not provide an adequately flexible arrangement for relating the government to the full spectrum of private sector initiative and activity. This idea has been a recurring theme in various reports of the last 10-15 years. But the most important consideration is the need to provide a rallying point, supporter and stimulator for the voluntary agencies in international affairs.

While the immediate prospects for creating this kind of mechanism do not appear bright, we should begin planning for it at the same time as we proceed with the adjustments and consolidations recommended in Option 3. A new mechanism could provide the leverage to move our country up to a new level of sophistication and effectiveness by strengthening the role of the private sector generally, and by emphasizing the people-to-people meaning which is at the heart of international education.

EWA:PSH/aa
October, 1968

I. INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared by Education and World Affairs (EWA), under contract, for submission to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). The background is a provision of the Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1968, directing the Secretary of HEW to conduct:

> "--a comprehensive study of all authorized Federal programs that have to do with educational activities aimed at improved international understanding and cooperation, with the objective of determining the extent of adjustment and consolidation of these programs that is desirable in order that their objectives may be more efficiently and expeditiously accomplished--"

In accordance with the terms of the contract between the Department of HEW and EWA, the latter organization assumes responsibility for the analysis, interpretations, and recommendations in this document. In submitting it to the Secretary, EWA hopes to make a useful contribution to the report which he will render to Congress in satisfaction of the above requirement of the 1968 Appropriations Act.

* * * * *

One year ago, College and University Business published a series of articles in a special section of its November issue, entitled "International Education: America's Hottest Cargo."

It is the thesis of the present report that (a) international education has indeed been a "hot cargo" for the United States over the last several decades; but that (b) the nation is not more than halfway toward meeting the needs which international education can potentially fulfill; and that (c) certain reordering of the programs and responsibilities of federal agencies in this field is necessary if we are to go the rest of the way.

Much has been accomplished in the past twenty years in the major areas of international education: strengthening of international studies, including area and language offerings, in American colleges and universities; research in international affairs; educational assistance to the less developed countries; and international student, teacher, and professor exchanges generally.

But the mood of the country and the emergence of staggering problems in urban America and in connection with the Vietnam war portend a loss of momentum in this field,as money and resources are transferred to other high priority needs. These circumstances call for a careful review of our traditional activities on the international front of education in order to assure their continuing relevance and vitality.

With respect to the role of the federal government -- the main focus of this study -- over 30 departments and agencies now report activities falling under this heading. Only six or seven agencies, however, have distinctive primary responsibilities in this area. As presented in Appendix B, the programs of all federal agencies involved present a picture of considerable dispersion and complexity. The reason for such scattering of international education activities through the government does not become immediately apparent, so there might appear to be a prima facie case for considerable "adjustment and consolidation." As the analysis in the latter sections of this report suggests, however, there are limits both in logic and in practice on the extent to which full unity and coherence of effort can be achieved.

It is in the nature of these activities that they do not fall into a pattern of neat symmetry or perfect clarity. Integration and order are important considerations, here as elsewhere. But to insist too rigidly on the ideal of coordination would be to lose other important values now being served. Perhaps the chief of these is that the involvement of many federal departments and agencies accurately mirrors the fact of outreach to the world of international affairs on the part of many major segments of American government and society, including those which are usually considered to be "domestically" oriented.

The answer to the present pattern of diffusion clearly does not lie at the one extreme of reorganizing all international education activities into a single monolithic structure. Neither does it consist in simply rationalizing as the best we can do the present pattern of dubiously-located functions, overlapping responsibilities, and major gaps of coverage. The aim must be to define an acceptable middle ground, one that will give greater coherence and efficiency to our efforts but will still permit involvement in international education by those agencies for whom such participation is relevant and important. The need is for a series of adjustments that could be made in the short run -- centering around the role of the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare as proposed in Section V -- followed by the initiation of more comprehensive changes for the longer run, as discussed in Section VI. Following these approaches in sequence, the United States could evolve a rational strategy for federal action in this field for the next decade.

The central focus of this report is, of course, on the changes, adjustments, and consolidation necessary to achieve our national goals more "efficiently and expeditiously." As prologue to the analysis and recommendations which make up the remaining sections of the report, therefore, it is suggested that the following are the major reasons for seeking new and improved arrangements in this field:

1. To define the criteria for establishing priorities and thus provide the basis for evaluating the federal government's efforts in international education across the board. (Currently there is no effective way of accomplishing this objective for the federal government generally. Activities are scattered, diverse purposes are being served, and no highly placed body or individual has been given the authority for evaluation and coordination. If, for example, it were felt that too much money was going into the support of social science field research abroad and too little into cultural presentations overseas or the support of foreign students in the United States, there would be no process to reach a balanced judgment on the issue nor means of reallocating funds between these categories of international education expenditures. The interagency council approach has served reasonably well as a communications device, but not as a technique of coordination.)

2. To achieve greater efficiency in the use of high-level manpower and funds, gaining a higher return in effective performance for every dollar spent.

3. To assure that the roles of the various agencies and the relationships among them are such as to realize the potentialities of close linkage, interpenetration, and mutual reinforcement, between the domestic and overseas aspects of international education.

4. To highlight the relevance of certain activities and processes of international education for the urgent domestic problems of American society, problems which are shared in identical or similar forms by many other countries, both advanced and less developed.

5. To refine our policies and procedures to the end that they not only serve United States needs, but take account of the sensitivities of people in the less advanced countries, thus helping to assure the acceptability of an "American presence" in educational matters and improving the climate for cooperative efforts.

II. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST: MEANING AND OBJECTIVES

What Is International Education?

"International education" is not a precise term. It is a broad concept embracing various activities that help to strengthen the international dimension of education in the United States and to foster educational progress in other countries.

Although exact definition is difficult, international education conjures up familiar pictures in the minds of most of us: foreign students by the tens of thousands enrolled in American universities and colleges, coming from almost every country of the world; a professor from Ann Arbor teaching at a French university under the Fulbright program; a Stanford biologist spending two years helping to build a scientific research laboratory at the University of East Africa; American undergraduates studying in Spain or Italy under a junior year abroad program; the Peace Corps volunteer teaching English in a remote village of Ecuador; the graduate student in Soviet studies on the Indiana campus, as well as the young man doing advanced work on Chinese linguistics in Taiwan; a Cornell graduate student engaged in field research for his doctoral dissertation in anthropology in a Thai village, as well as a senior professor using survey techniques in sociological field work in Brazil.

The term may lack precision, but at least it communicates these images. International education embraces many disparate activities related to most of the major disciplines and fields of knowledge, and provides a link between the United States and virtually every foreign country -- large and small. It is best pictured as a wide umbrella, covering many processes by which people move between countries and ideas, understanding and skills are transferred across national and cultural boundaries. It involves the familiar three-way thrust of education -- in teaching, research and service.

The clearest manner of defining international education is in terms of its major, conventional types of activity. Thus it includes:

1. Research in international affairs and area studies, to provide information and understanding necessary for wise national policies, and for the scientific advancement of the disciplines and fields of knowledge.

2. The development of trained manpower, teachers and research scholars for institutions of higher learning, as well as practitioners to staff America's international enterprises, governmental and private.

3. The achievement of "national literacy" in world affairs -- through schools, colleges, universities, and adult education -- so that as a people we can cope more intelligently with the complexities of international affairs.

4. Educational and cultural exchanges, the most familiar and traditional mainstream of activity, providing opportunities at different levels for experience and enrichment through foreign study, teaching, and travel.

5. Educational cooperation with the less-developed countries, through direct assistance in institution-building, educational planning, and teaching in the other country, and by educating in the United States many foreign students and technical and professional trainees who come to these shores.

Relation to National Interest

In light of the extensive activity making up international education, it is important to be clear about the "Why?" and the "For what purposes?" of this field. Since much of this international content and contact in education is supported by the families of students, by the philanthropic foundations, by the universities and colleges, and by voluntary organizations and other private groups, what is that rationale of federal government involvement? What, in fact, is the national interest in encouraging, facilitating, and financing international education?

The most explicit answer to this question is found in the words of Congress itself, in the "Findings and Declaration" section of the International Education Act of 1966:

> "The Congress hereby finds and declares that a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research, to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel in academic and professional fields, and to coordinate the existing and future programs of the Federal Government in international education, to meet the requirements of world leadership."

The message of this Congressional declaration is clear: to sustain a position of effective and compassionate world leadership, the United States must have a continuing flow of knowledge, and expanding resources of both specialized manpower and educated citizens; we must meet the responsibility which our wealth and advantages give us to share our experience and skills with less developed peoples; and these basic national interests are well served by the spectrum of activities that we refer to as international education. This Congressional definition of national purposes in this field is further amplified by observing the various rationales that have been advanced over the years.

First, there is the concept of promoting better understanding among the nations of the world in the belief that all peoples thus become more sensitive to the problems of their fellows, thus reducing international antagonisms and tensions. This is a world peace and stability rationale of international education. It has figured prominently in the justification of a number of federal programs, from the Fulbright-Hays Act, to the USIA libraries and bi-national centers overseas, to the Peace Corps.

Second, there is a *highly pragmatic objective* which is often advanced for international education. For practical reasons, it is in America's immediate interests to know a great deal about other countries and their people -- including their language, history, culture and traditions -- people with whom we do business, or whose affairs may have a direct impact on us, or who are now, or may later become, our allies or our adversaries. Programs for training international affairs practitioners, area and language specialists, and experts in related professional fields, are all pointed toward this almost operational objective. (Within the same framework is the explicit intelligence purpose of gaining "knowledge of others." Here the ultimate utilization of information -- producing national estimates on other countries for our military and foreign policy establishments -- seems uncongenial to the accepted norms of international education. But in intellectual concept and to some degree in the techniques employed, it still corresponds to one of the conventional motifs of international education.)

Third, *the cold-war or "keeping-up-with-the-Russians" has been the impulse to action in certain cases*. Some of our development assistance programs have been justified in pre-emptive terms, the U.S. undertaking certain moves so that the Soviets would not get into the particular country first. And our libraries and information centers in other countries are usually conceived of as means of portraying the "American way" -- they are thus very much part of a worldwide competition with the Russians. The National Defense Education Act, of course -- Title VI of which has been a mainstay of language and area studies in the universities -- was a highly specific reaction to Sputnik as evidence of Russian advances in science, technology and education.

Fourth, there is the objective reflected in the *undergraduate study of international affairs and non-Western cultures*, that of achieving a *truly liberal education* corresponding to contemporary needs. It is often argued that in the mid-twentieth century no person, certainly no college graduate, can consider himself genuinely educated unless he has gained some appreciation of the intricacies of world affairs, the aspirations and accomplishments of other peoples, and the achievements of other civilizations, both contemporary and past. This is only indirectly related to world peace or the training of practitioners. The aim here is rather to make the individual person a more sensitive, more sophisticated human being, a truly modern man. It is assumed that the nation's best interests are served when as many as possible of its citizens meet this criterion.

Fifth, there are explicitly scientific and intellectual objectives advanced for international education: the expansion of knowledge for its own sake, for the scientific growth of various fields and areas of inquiry. The goal of full "internationalization" of the social science and humanistic disciplines has, for many decades, been one of scholarship's leading goals. In order to bring greater rigor and scientific validity to their fields, academicians must look to the verification of basic hypotheses in social settings outside of Western culture, where, in most instances, these disciplines originated and grew. Research in ethnology, linguistics, or economics, carried out on African subject matter, helps to advance fundamental knowledge in those fields as well as contributing to our understanding of Africa as a major region of the world. Obviously no discipline -- especially in the social sciences -- can claim the universality of true science if it can interpret only the phenomena of the developed Western countries.

Finally, a major objective pursued through international education is cooperation with other countries to accelerate their own development. For the most part, the process is to provide technical aid, capital, and equipment to the less-advanced countries -- including the training of their people on the campuses, and in a variety of other special programs, in the United States. Justification for these cooperative efforts usually rests on the proposition that educational development is necessary for economic progress, and that together they tend to foster political maturity and stability. In any event, development cooperation by the United States helps to satisfy human wants and reduce frustrations in the less advanced countries, and thus contributes to the foundations of the orderly and peaceful world which this nation seeks as a prime goal of its foreign policy.

In all of these ways, the United States' efforts in international education have been interpreted as supporting out best interests as a people. Underlying and intertwined with such publicly advanced rationales, however, are various motivations. Business, commercial and profit considerations are sometimes in the background of what we do. National security interests are also frequently involved. Many Americans are surely impelled by a basic humanitarian drive of wanting, out of a sense of dedication and mission, to help the "weary, oppressed and downtrodden" of other lands.

Further Complexities Facing "Adjustment and Consolidation"

The fact that international education has been justified in terms of multiple and varied rationales, and that a mixture of motives is at work -- some nobler than others -- complicates both analysis and prescription. There is no easy, single thread to follow in the quest for greater consolidation of effort in federal agency programs. Any hope of achieving a completely logical, tidy packaging of activities confronts formidable obstacles. In addition to the multiple objectives already discussed, there is a further series of complexities and apparent dichotomies inherent in international education.

First, international education takes place both at home and abroad, and also, as it were, in between: it is found in the curriculum of the colleges and universities of America, in the teaching services rendered by visiting American professors in overseas universities, and also in the short-term exchange visits between American teachers and those of other lands.

Second, the flow of benefits, ideally at least, is in both directions, along a two-way street. Although this reciprocity in the flow of ideas and knowledge may not always be realized in practice, international education still cannot be explained exclusively in either "foreign aid" or "American advantage" terms. When U.S. professors spend several years teaching and helping to build departments in the newer universities of the developing countries, they of course contribute to educational progress there. But at the same time they learn about the other society and its people, and later share that knowledge with their colleagues and students at home. The situation is similar with the largest single activity of international education, the more than 100,000 foreign students on American campuses. They not only gain experience and acquire skills valuable in the development of their own countries, but through them, United States students, teachers, colleges, schools, local organizations, and indeed, whole communities frequently become acquainted with other parts of the world. This concept of the two-way street is at the very heart of the enterprise.

Third, as has already been suggested, motivations of both self-interest and altruism are simultaneously at work in the background of our international education efforts. Americans usually prefer not to confess to altruism in public, however, so in our formal justifications of these programs we are likely to submerge any such instinct. Although Americans have a long and generous tradition of giving money, time and effort because this "is the right thing to do for others" -- still with government programs, it is on the self-interest of the nation that the argument is usually made. The confusion arises, however, when it turns out that we expect the kind of responses -- gratitude, affection, allegiance -- that are suitable only if we are moved by altruistic and charitable impulses -- if even then. So we are sometimes caught in a nasty paradox: we proclaim a new program involving cooperation with and assistance to others, but place it specifically in the framework of United States self-interest, and later show astonishment that it has not brought this country sentiments of love and appreciation from the people of other lands!

Fourth, international education has, at one time or another, been justified both in foreign policy terms and in genuine educational terms. By definition it is a meeting ground for the foreign affairs interests of the nation and our goal of enriching and improving the education of Americans. At least until very recently, the foreign policy rationale has tended to predominate. It has become traditional to consider international educational exchanges as primarily "an arm of foreign policy" or "the fourth dimension of foreign affairs: or one of the "instruments" the nation uses on the world scene. Whether cause or effect, the Department of State has always played the lead role, its position having been strengthened by the creation of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs in 1961. Two other agencies with important international education programs -- AID and USIA -- are within the foreign policy complex and are subject to substantial guidance and supervision by the State Department. The United States Information Service (USIS), the overseas arm of USIA, has administered official educational representation in the embassies abroad since the early 1950s. And both at home and abroad, the State Department has been at the center of the stage, holding the chairmanship of the Federal Interagency Council on Educational and Cultural Affairs in Washington, and through its ambassadors, having explicit leadership of U.S. "country teams" in the field.

To focus on educational values and meaning would represent a difference in emphasis and degree. Educational programs in the international sphere would be pursued for their own inherent purposes rather than as an adjunct of foreign policy. So interpreted, international education would enjoy considerable independence from the day-to-day foreign policy concerns of the State Department, and would be subject to minimum supervision and guidance from that quarter. It would not be advertised as an instrument designed to advance the nation's political and diplomatic interests.

The President's International Education Program, announced i the Message to Congress of February 2, 1966, and especially the International Education Act itself, rested primarily on the "educational" interpretation of efforts in this field. The tendency was to bring the two divergent orientations within international education more into balance. But the failure to implement most of the 1966 proposals, and the non-funding of the IEA mean that we still have the status quo ante. The traditional foreign policy connotation of international education still prevails.

Finally, one of the distinctive characteristics of international education is that it is an area of shared public responsibility and private effort. It is by definition one of the most important points of intersection between the interests of the academic community and those of the federal government on the international front. The real actors on this stage are, of cours scholars, universities and colleges, voluntary associations, youn people studying in countries other than their own, scientists attending international congresses, and the like. The private sector has played a key role in generating new programs, bringing innovation, and organizing sources of financial support.

The relationship between government and the private sector has been essentially a cooperative one. But there has never been an exact blueprint of what the division of labor should be. Instead, funding, program initiation and operation, efforts to develop appropriate constituencies -- these and others have taken place in both the public and private sectors. Although an exact delineation of roles is probably impossible and perhaps undesirab it would be helpful to all concerned if a philosophy and rational of government participation could be evolved. Since we assume that non-governmental organizations and voluntary agencies can serve public purposes, considerable latitude should be left to them. But it is the responsibility of the federal government in the last analysis to define and implement the national interest. It should therefore assume an active role in establishing the general framework for these efforts, providing leadership, facilitating private group participation, and granting financial support.

* * * * *

It is logical that any discussion of the meaning and objectiv of international education should return to the question of the national interest and the respective roles and responsibilities of the federal government and the private sector. Because the question which this report attempts to answer is what adjustments and consolidations should be made in the international education programs of federal agencies, the focus is strongly on the role of government. The document therefore does not reflect adequately the significance of private efforts. But in the background of the entire study has been a recognition of the prime importance of non-governmental initiative and participation.

The question really being discussed here highlights one crucial aspect of a complex problem facing America for the 1970s -- how this nation can relate effectively and constructively with the other peoples of the world, especially those of the less advanced countries -- how we can respond to their hopes, aspirations and legitimate expectations. Our performance in international education will be one of the determinants of our success in meeting this responsibility of a world power. And under our democratic system the key question is whether we can develop an ever more efficient working partnership between government and the private sector.

III. PAST ACCOMPLISHMENTS, PRESENT REALITIES, AND FUTURE NEEDS

Accomplishments

The nation's achievements in international education form the necessary backdrop for any recommendations of future program arrangements and agency responsibilities. It is natural to want to know what has been accomplished by the efforts of several decades. Where have the payoffs been? Have we gained a reasonable return, in terms of the objectives of international education from the investments made?

It is impossible to offer firm objective evidence on an across-the-board basis. In the first place, statistical totals give a picture only of growth rates in terms of numbers of persons participating and dollars spent. They do not indicate how well we have achieved our goals because sheer size of investment or of individual involvement is scarcely a measure of performance.

Second, the real meaning of international education is found in the realm of attitudes, ideas, intellectual growth and the spread of understanding. Few objective standards can be applied in assessing impact here. (It is because quantification and reliance on numerical indices in this field tend to be not only unhelpful but perhaps even misleading, that no attempt has been made to derive overall totals -- in dollars, in programs or in people -- from the federal agency programs summarized in Appendix B.)

So it is not in figures and numerical growth rates that the justification for investment in international education must be sought. One must look instead to the sensed worth and value of certain activities, adducing general evidence to support them and recognizing that the case cannot be proved statistically and definitively.

It is by no means impossible to identify important areas of progress and to grasp what they have meant to the nation. On a number of fronts, the picture of United States' participation in international educational activity is perceptibly different from that of 20 or 30 years ago. The author of this report attempted, in another place, to portray this three-decade contrast in the setting of university international studies:

"Most of the current trends and directions on the international side of higher education have emerged during the living memory of those who now labor in this vineyard. But to many of us, the pace seems painfully slow. The road is winding and full of ruts. Our patience wears thin. There is no easier exercise than to describe the shortfall as American education has sought to come of age in international affairs.

But have we truly moved only at a snail's pace these last two decades? If our object here is to make some educated guesses as to how this aspect of higher education will develop by 1980, we must first be clear as to where we stood 15 or 20 years ago; 1946 is a good bench mark. It was midway in a decade dominated by depression and war, a period of little ferment in the universities and colleges of the land. In fact, there was relatively little development in the world-affairs aspects of higher education during the entire 30 years down to 1950. So to take a rough measure of how far we had come by 1966, we could go back to 1946, or 1936, or indeed to 1926. True, there would be decade variations, but over all, it was, in the matters that concern us here, a remarkably "stable" period.

Let us, therefore, fix on a bright young student who, as a freshman in 1936, was highly motivated for the study of international relations. He entered a major Eastern university, one of the very few institutions in the country with any kind of reputation for prestige work in international studies. In the curriculum, he found that most of the work which interested him was confined to a set pattern of courses: European diplomatic history (those tedious meanderings through the chanceries of Vienna, Berlin, Paris, and London); international economics and finance (a highly traditional laissez-faire approach to the theory of international trade and monetary transactions); and international politics, law, and organization (where some time was spent analyzing and much time lamenting the ineffectiveness of the League of Nations and the paralysis that afflicted the Anglo-Franco-American world as the storm clouds of a new war gathered).

Among his teachers, he was unlikely to encounter any sociologist, psychologist, demographer, or perhaps even anthropologist who had intimate firsthand knowledge of any other part of the world than Europe. "Overseas research" was a phrase that had not yet entered the educational lexicon; it was apparently an activity engaged in by archeologists in the Near East, with pick and shovel, or by classical scholars at the American Academy in Rome, or by historians in the Paris archives and the London Museum. Teachers of French language and literature went to Provence during vacations and professors of international organization summered in Geneva. But the foreign experience of faculty people rarely extended beyond these conventionalized patterns.

The young man's career opportunities probably appeared to him as a crossroads at which he stood looking down two straight highways that moved into the future at sharply angled directions. He could take the Foreign Service exams and become, if he passed, a Class 8 vice-consul in the Latin-American tropics, inching his way upward through the diplomatic service over the next 40 years. Or he might go on to graduate school and become a teacher of the subject, or to law school and hope to find his way into the esoteric world of international law. There was neither AID, USIA, or Peace Corps; nor were there opportunities abroad with the Ford or Rockefeller Foundations; and almost none of the present complement of private agencies that send young Americans to study and work in foreign countries had been developed. In fact, during his undergraduate and graduate years the chances of his having an overseas experience were close to zero. There was no Fulbright program, no Social Science Research Council Training Fellowships, no Ford Foundation Foreign Area Fellowships. Rare indeed was the university that had money of its own to permit students at any level to work or study in a foreign country.

The educational possibilities in world affairs open to our student of the 1930s mirrored the actual role of the United States in the world. The content was parochial, underdeveloped and

Europe-focused; the approach tended to be traditional and moralistic (recall how the nation was then defining its national interest through endless debates over the finer points of the Neutrality Act!); and his teachers knew little of the vast world of Russia, the Near East, Asia, Africa, and Latin America that lies out beyond the familiar capitals of London, Paris, Rome, and Vienna.

It is worth remembering, finally, that we set the stage for this vignette of the 1930s in terms of one of the large Eastern institutions that could, in that day, claim leadership in the study of international affairs. We were not reviewing an "average" situation. This suggests how bleak the general landscape was for university-level work in world affairs.

The sharp contrasts awaiting the son of our student from the 1930s as he enters college in 1968 are too apparent to belabor: they are implicit in every characterization of that earlier period. Opportunities abound for young men and women today to build their higher education around the subject matter of international relations and the study of other cultures, or at least to learn something about this field along the way as they pursue their degrees in other professional, scientific, or disciplinary areas. The world has surely come to the doorstep of the American campus. And the student quite literally does make the world his campus." *

Many elements of our 30-year story of achievement are suggested in this passage. To amplify the picture, one may contemplate the number of Americans who have been involved in international education, at different stages of their lives, and the impact this has surely had on responsible citizenship for world affairs in the United States. One can visualize a large world map with a vast array of pins indicating overseas locations where Americans have studied, taught, done research, and provided other educational and technical services. One may imagine the hundreds of dots that would light up on a suitably wired map of the United States to mark the universities and colleges which today have significant programs and general curricula in international studies -- in contrast to the 10 or 15 institutions that could have been so identified even 20 years ago. And each light on the map, of course,

---

* William W. Marvel, "The University and the World", in Alvin C. Eurich, ed., Campus 1980: The Shape of the Future in American Higher Education, New York: Delacorte Press, 1968, pp. 68-70.

is a symbol of many faculty members and hundreds of students -- the latter constituting perhaps millions of citizens by this time who have gained some understanding of international affairs during their college years and are now scattered throughout American society representing almost every walk of life.

To complete this picture of growth and development in international education over the last several decades, we turn now to certain segments of the field where the sense of achievement is especially marked.

(1) Language and area studies have grown from a handful of programs in a few institutions in the late 1940s to more than 150 programs now, covering all of the 8 or 10 major regions of the world, located in some 65 universities. (This does not include other types of international affairs programs, institutes, and centers, a category that has grown proportionately over these same decades.)

(2) The post World War II phenomenon of rapidly growing numbers of United States citizens working, teaching and studying abroad -- documented in Harlan Cleveland's 1960 study, The Overseas Americans -- might have occurred independently of what went on in the universities during the 1950s. But in fact there was a close connection between the expanding ranks of the overseas Americans on the one hand, and the growing attention that the universities were paying to international studies on both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

(3) Although one cannot make a direct causal connection between the kind of education college students were receiving in the 1950s and "the American challenge in Europe" as portrayed in the thesis of Jean Jacques Servan-Schreiber, it seems likely that many of the "agents" of this U.S. industrial and commercial expansion on the continent are young Americans who experienced the growing international enrichment of higher education in the years after World War II.

(4) To cite a random example of another kind, of the fourteen specialists on Chinese, Asian and general international affairs who testified during the Special Hearings on China policy held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in March, 1966, eleven were academics whose principal association over the years, as student and/or professor, was with one of the major university international studies programs.

(5) The dramatic expansion of foreign language teaching at every level, elementary to graduate school, is familiar to most parents and citizens. The number of languages offered, the rapid growth of the more difficult languages in higher education, the extension of Russian into hundreds of United States high schools (from 1959 to 1964, the number of schools increased from eight or ten to over 500), and now even the start of Chinese language teaching in a few high schools -- all this shows the pace and direction of events as Americans have become more serious about learning foreign languages.

(6) American undergraduate programs abroad have grown in such numbers and variety that they are now considered a not-unmixed blessing. From a half-dozen junior year abroad programs in 1950, the number grew to 22 in 1956 and by 1965 there were 208 such college-sponsored programs. Although some of these overseas activities cause serious qualms because of their indifferent quality, many are well conceived and effectively conducted. Their effect on the new generation of young Americans is almost certainly healthy and enriching. Taking into account the more than 200 college programs, and those operated by such private organizations as the Experiment in International Living and the American Field Service, this one form of international education has probably reached into most of the cities and large towns of the United States.

(7) One of the breakthrough ideas of the post-war period was the conception of the Fulbright program: use of surplus U.S.-owned foreign currencies to support international exchanges at the graduate and advanced study levels. Now, more than 20 years after its inception the Fulbright Program has benefitted well over 30,000 Americans through grants for study, teaching and research in other countries, and nearly twice that many (57,000) foreign scholars and students who have come to the United States for educational purposes.

(8) The most familiar form of international education activity is the flow of foreign students to the campuses of America -- a phenomenon of which the Fulbright Program is a part, but numerically only a small part. Much has been written on this subject. The unremitting increases, year after year, in the number of students from abroad, has become a familiar annual statistic.

But it is extremely difficult to assess the contribution made to our objectives in international education by the foreign student phenomenon. The planning and conduct of their education is a vexing question from one end of the United States to the other. Some of these young people doubtless return home displeased with their experience here and perhaps hostile towards America. But it is the conviction of those who work closely with foreign students that many more of them leave these shores with greater understanding and sentiments of friendship and cordiality toward the United States. To confirm this assumption, one need only ask the president of any major university who has traveled extensively in other countries. His answer is likely to be that he was especially sought out, and often feted to the point of exhaustion, by the loyal foreign alumni of his institution!

(9) Another important innovation of the 1950s was the university contract system for technical assistance pioneered by the Foreign Operations Administration, one of AID's predecessor agencies. Although this form of U.S. academic participation in teaching and institution-building overseas has not been uniformly successful, it has in general been a significant means of expanding the international dimension of American higher education. Beginning with the early relationships between one or two American universities and several counterpart institutions abroad, this AID system has now grown to the point where now there are about 150 contracts held by 67 American universities for work in some 40 countries of the less developed world.

(10) The major recent innovation in this area is the Peace Corps. Begun in the early 1960s, it has grown steadily to the point where now almost 18,000 Volunteers -- all young Americans who have served abroad in teaching and other technical assistance operations -- have returned home having added an international dimension to their understanding of human problems and social organization. (Almost 14,000 other PC Volunteers are now in training, or in service overseas.) The Peace Corps may turn out to be one of the most effective means of international education this country has yet devised. Its impact, in the sense of how much these returned Volunteers feed back into the life and mind of our society, is hard to measure. But the spirit of adventure, courage, compassion and service to others which pervades the Peace Corps, corresponds exactly to the dominant motif of the younger generation in the late 1960s, regardless of whether a cause and effect relationship can be shown.

(11) If, despite the crucial role of the federal government, international education is at heart a "private affair", one of the main threats is found in the work of the many private voluntary organizations and associations, conducting programs both in this

country and overseas. More Americans have probably become concerned about international programs through the efforts of the Quakers, other missionary bodies and secular voluntary groups, than in any other way. And in the United States, untold thousands of citizens have been reached, directly or indirectly, by the World Affairs Councils and other adult education efforts -- including the extension services of our major universities -- in cities and communities across the country.

(12) It is likely that the international education activity which has put us in touch with the largest cumulative audience overseas is English language teaching, supported by many federal agencies and private groups. Here again, the measurement of impact is exceedingly difficult, but what impressionistic evidence we have suggests that these programs are much desired and widely acceptable, especially in the underdeveloped countries.

* * * * *

This brief catalogue of major elements of America's record in international education over the last several decades is not meant to suggest that all programs have been effectively conducted nor have contributed fully to achieving our goals. There is much room for a differential appraisal of results and much need to adjust priorities for the future.

In concluding this discussion of past accomplishments there is one highly important claim that can be made for international education. The great variety of opportunities for learning and experience falling under this broad umbrella helped unquestionably to condition the mind of America to the world leadership position in which this country found itself after World War II. The United States was called upon to support a whole set of new and unfamiliar commitments reaching to the far corners of the globe. To shift quickly from the comfortable observer role we had had in world politics over the decades of our isolationism, required a massive change in public attitudes. This was somehow accomplished, and a share of the credit belongs to efforts in the area of international education.

Present Realities

It is an inescapable fact of the current balance of forces among the nations that the American people must again make a quantum shift in their attitudes toward world affairs.

If no other argument for international education were found persuasive, this alone would be sufficient justification for a renewed and invigorated effort in this field.

Immediately after World War II and on into the 1950s, this country occupied the pinnacle of might and influence in the world. That era has now passed and it has been succeeded by a period when power is widely distributed around the globe. Our ability to shape events is severely reduced, as is that of all the former "great powers."

It is not likely that we shall adjust easily or painlessly to the new reality of our non-omnipotence. Already there is a tendency toward polarization in American attitudes: either it is our destiny to police the world or else we should withdraw from it and concentrate on the solution of our urgent domestic problems. Professor Karl Deutsch of Harvard University presents the following cogent analysis of the relationship among a nation's power, its involvement in the affairs of the outside world, and public attitudes supporting international commitments:

"Support for research on international relations is related to the involvement of a country in world affairs, and the international involvement of the United States recently has begun to change in major ways. The international involvement of a nation is partly based on its power, in terms of its ability to make its own will -- its national preferences and desires -- prevail over those of other nations; and it is also based in part on its national stake in world affairs, in terms of its size, its vulnerability and its foreign commitments -- economic, cultural, political, and strategic.

International involvement based on power is associated with psychological rewards. The greater the superiority of one's power, the more pleasant it is to think of how to guide the fate of less fortunate countries; or even how to run the world, how to master and improve it according to one's national ethos and one's heart's desire. To think and plan about world affairs in such a god-like role can yield profound pleasure to one's emotion and imagination.

International involvement based on the size of one's stakes and risks, one's openness and exposure to events and threats from abroad, one's commitments and vulnerability is, on the contrary, associated with psychic deprivations. It is apt to lead to anxiety and fear, latent or overt resentment, and a lively desire for escape -- even if only by the withdrawal of attention.

Most men tend to turn their attention toward those things which they find manageable and rewarding, and away from those which they do not. In regard to international affairs, Americans long have been very human in this sense. Until World War II, while American power in the world arena was relatively limited, American research and intellectual concern about world affairs was likewise limited. During the first two decades after World War II, when American power had risen to an unprecendented peak, American research on world affairs, with some time lag, likewise rose to unprecendented heights.

Since the mid-1960's, this situation has been changing. In 1945, the United States had more than one-half of the world's income and produced more than one-half of the world's steel. Today we account for less than one-third of world income, and less than one-quarter of world steel production. And in 1945, we had a monopoly of nuclear weapons and of means for their delivery, while today we have not. Our relative power has declined. It is still formidable and will remain so, but it no longer can make our will prevail quickly in distant theaters; it cannot overawe rival superpowers; and its relative margin of superiority may well continue to decline." (From a paper prepared for an Education and World Affairs committee discussion)

Linked to this interpretation of America's declining attention to international affairs is the fact that, far from feeling all-powerful, we often find ourselves unable to exercise our will, or to make our influence felt, in the degree to which we had become accustomed. Military power has proved ineffective in forcing a decision in the United States' second land war on the Asian mainland in less than two decades. For most of the 1960's we have been living with Exhibit A of our neutralized power, ninety miles of Florida. No influence, or force we are prepared to use, has proved sufficient to alter the flow of events in Cuba toward a more congenial course.

In 1965, the United States found diplomatic means of handling a situation so near to our shores as the Dominican Republic inadequate, and thereupon proceeded with an overt, old-style, military intervention in the Caribbean. America's best efforts to assist nation-building seem to have almost dissolved in the case of Nigeria. Where we had given so much and hoped so sincerely, we must now stand impotently by and watch the denouement of one of the great human tragedies of the 20th century: the decimation of thousands of Biafran people.

In little more than twelve months, the American people have witnessed two traumatic events on the international scene, both in flagrant violation of the principles the United States professes in the conduct of world affairs. Neither with the 1967 five-day war between Israel and the Arab States nor with the Soviet take-over of Czechslovakia in the summer of 1968, could the United States prevent, soften or influence the harsh impact of events. For a people grown accustomed since the Second World War to the notion of near-omnipotence coupled with beneficent purpose, this new sense of the unmanageability of foreign affairs -- to borrow Karl Deutsch's term -- was sure to produce frustration with the complex, recalcitrant outer world.

One of the most sharply-etched current realities is the reduced willingness of the United States to spend public funds on what were traditionally considered the positive and constructive programs of international affairs: technical assistance to the less fortunate countries, educational exchange, international affairs curricula in colleges and universities, scientific and cultural exchanges, and others. The reluctance to invest in international education has appeared with dramatic force during the legislative year of 1968. The International Education Act, passed with apparent enthusiasm by the Congress two years ago, has met failure on every attempt to secure any part of its authorized funds, even a token appropriation. The budget of the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, always the object of lively interest and substantial paring by the Congress, was more drastically cut than usual -- by more than one-third. The difficulties which the foreign aid program has faced year after year in its annual encounter with Congress have become a familiar, and by now almost unremarkable, part of the legislative year. But in 1968 the AID budget reduction was unprecedently large, pegging the total appropriations for foreign aid at the lowest level ever.

The education component of the foreign assistance program was not necessarily singled out for special attention, but simply shared the fate of the Agency's appropriations in general. Because it had become in recent years the largest single component of U.S. international cooperation in education, this cut-back in AID funds intensifies the already dark picture of government financial support for international education. The clear reality is that for the first time this year there is substantially less money for things specifically earmarked as "international" -- and there may be still less in the years ahead.

It is obvious, however, that what some observers are now calling a "retreat from internationalism" among the American public is not the only, nor indeed the most important, reason for the financial difficulties besetting international education. A much more direct impact is being exerted by the compelling demand for a larger share of our national resources by both the war in Vietn and the imperative that America move quickly toward equality of opportunity for all races, the reduction of poverty, and the rebuilding of its deteriorated urban centers.

The years 1965 to 1968 witnessed the steady escalation of "the Vietnam problem" -- in Southeast Asia, in the United States Congress, and among the American people generally. And this was accompanied, during the very months when efforts were being made to pass and fund the International Education Act, by another epis which contributed to a general sense of perplexity and malaise wi respect to the government's international programs. This was the disclosure in February 1967 of covert financial support from the Central Intelligence Agency for the overseas programs of various private voluntary agencies, several of them related to education. This became a source of vexation and anxiety in many sectors of the U.S. academic community. Logic suggested that the approach then being proposed under the Administration's International Educ tion Program was a promising and attractive alternative to such secret funding by CIA. But the net effect was otherwise, hardeni the opposition to the new initiatives in international education and intensifying the general feeling of unease among Americans with respect to things international.

There is a natural temptation to assume that the scaling dow or termination of our Vietnam involvement will bring an immediate turning on of the faucet of public resources for a variety of other national purposes including international education.

This is illusory. In the first place, as a nation we are still seriously underestimating the magnitude of the urban and racial crisis and the size of the bill that must be paid to redee our social health and welfare on this front. The easy optimism which has often been remarked as an essential part of the America character results in a tendency to miscalculate on the lower side the scale of our problems and the cost of their solution. Nowher is this more apparent than with respect to the awesome difficulti we face in the ghettos and other poverty-ridden areas of the coun try. It is doubtful that the situation is perceived as being serious enough, and that the will of leaders is strong enough, to cause an allotment of the required portion of our GNP to this problem area. But even if the Vietnam war were to end next month and by some miracle of resource reallocation, all the dollars now going into the military effort in Southeast Asia could be divert to cope with the crisis of our cities, even then the amounts ava able would probably prove inadequate.

Worse still, no such miracle of priority re-scaling away from the military establishment is likely to occur. Already positions are being staked out to maintain defense spending at extremely high levels in the post-Vietnam peace. The prospect of military hardware research and new weapons-systems development of great complexity and high cost are even now being sifted into the arena of public awareness. Even if these hopes of the military are not realized, we are certain to discover that the war in Vietnam is not the only thing that has been escalated in the last few years. Along with raising the level of annual defense expenditures to record-breaking heights in the last few years, we have elevated correspondingly the expectations of the military establishment and its capacity to make effective -- whether we are at peace or war -- its claim on a very high percentage of America's GNP.

Future Needs

The point was made at the outset of this report that the United States has not gone more than halfway in satisfying those needs to which international education activities can contribute. To continue our progress, the following requirements must be met. They add up to a reasonable agenda for a country which is both a practicing democracy and one of the most powerful nations on earth.

First, the United States must move much farther along the road toward full national literacy in world affairs for the country's citizens. Although the course has been uneven and setbacks have been experienced, the contrast in public understanding of international affairs from the 1920s to the 1960s is dramatic. To continue that progress at the same rate is not adequate, for one of the evident facts of contemporary life is the telescoping of events in time and the steady acceleration of change. If our achievement of national literacy is to move at the same pace we cannot hold the line nor progress at the same rate as in the past. We must have a corresponding acceleration of effort. This calls for the extension of world affairs research, curricula, and programs into all of the nearly 2,000 four-year institutions of higher learning. It calls for a concerted effort to enrich teaching in the nation's rapidly growing number of two-year junior and community colleges, and in the schools of the nation, from the elementary grades to high school. For world affairs teaching to expand and improve in the nation's schools requires special attention to teacher training all across the country. And finally, no strategy for closing the sizeable gap in national literacy will be complete until we have devised ways to stimulate and support efforts in the field of adult and continuing education.

Second, there is a need that stares out at Americans from the headlines of their newspapers almost daily in 1968 -- a demand which can be responded to in part by invigorated international education efforts in the colleges and universities. Paramount in the student-energized ferment now boiling through American campuses is the question of the relevance of education to the realities and demands of modern life. One avenue leading to the genuinely modernized and relevant curriculum which the more serious and constructive student dissents seek is in the area of international affairs and foreign languages and cultures, including the rapidly growing interest in Afro-American studies. The universities and colleges of America face the imperative of re-thinking their role in society, restructuring their institutions and reordering their processes. Although alone this is by no means the full answer, one route which the universities should take in responding to their current travail is to exploit the potentialities of international studies. At the minimum, they provide a nexus to relate the worried young people of this student generation with the problems of human society in other parts of the globe.

Third, the demand of a leading world power like the United States for highly trained people -- to staff its international diplomatic, military, business, technical assistance, and voluntary agency enterprises -- is virtually insatiable. This need is different in kind and degree from the imperative of national literacy, but both depend on essentially the same resources: the colleges, universities and other educational institutions. This point was forcefully stated in a policy statement by the Board of Trustees of Education and World Affairs in 1967:

> "Ever since the Second World War, the role of the United States in world affairs has placed heavy demands on the international research and training programs of our universities and colleges. Despite the growth of these programs in the academic community over the past twenty years, however, we have by no means reached the levels in research and the training of specialists necessary to support the nation's worldwide commitments. To cite an especially dramatic example: a recent search for U.S. scholars pursuing research on Vietnam revealed only eight such individuals in the entire country - at a time when Vietnam constitutes the overriding problem in foreign affairs for the United States."

Fourth, there is an urgent need for objective and constructive criticism, by well informed and detached analysts, of the role of the military-industrial complex in American society -- in the exact sense of former President Eisenhower's use of that phrase in his "farewell address" to the nation. This is clearly a need which should be met through the research and training activities of the social science and international studies segment of the academic community. The share of the GNP and especially of the federal budget, going to military and related expenditures is huge and getting learger. These allocations are responsible for many of the funding shortages in other areas of government activity. The excellent career development program of the armed forces over the past twenty years has produced a cadre of highly educated and articulate officers who represent the military most effectively in dealings with other parts of the government and with the private sector.

In contrast, there has been a withering away of the ranks of those on the civilian side of government and in the private sector who, by training and experience, should be in a position to serve as the society's counterbalance to the demands of the military establishment. Through the 1950s there was considerable activity in the academic community on the part of scholars concerned with civil-military relations, the analysis of national security policies, and broad strategic, geo-political thinking about American foreign policy. Through accident and the changing tides of academic interests, the group of men capable of detached, objective analysis and criticism in this field have diminished almost to the point of invisibility. There is no effective counterweight to the capabilities of the military in making effective their claim on an extremely large slice of the federal budget. This situation is not healthy.

College and university programs in international affairs and the work of research institutes and individual scholars constitute the base from which a cadre of social analysts of military and defense programs can be developed anew. Money alone is not the answer. But money in the right places, combined with a second-round stimulation of academic research and inquiry in this field would begin to provide the answer.

Fifth, another national need which can be met by putting money in the right places for international education, combined with the more careful articulation of purposes and a modicum of academic self-policing, relates to the role of American educators overseas in both research and development assistance. Through our failure to perceive clearly the relationship between overseas research and institution-building activities in the less advanced countries, through an undue casualness in approach and performance, we have allowed the good reputation of the United States and its academic community to suffer unnecessary damage. The 1965 Camelot episode in Chile may be the most dramatic instance, but it has by no means been the only case where we find confusion of identity, a harmful mixture of intelligence-collecting and academic purposes, and a failure to link constructively our research and development activities.

It is entirely possible to enhance the stature of the nation in the eyes of others by assuring that our policies and programs conform to certain elemental truths. One of the most important is that scholars conducting research overseas should take active account of the other country's developmental needs in education and research. An important link with educational development needs is established when U.S. scholars enter into cooperative arrangements with universities, research institutes and individuals in the host country, contributing to the progress of education there through teaching, working with local graduate students, and giving professional advice. Donor agencies themselves can exercise positive influence by fostering, through their grants, this kind of relationship abroad.

These are five aspects of America's future needs in areas related to international education. They are needs, not in the sense of a bill of particulars or a projection of required dollar outlays -- but in terms of the prerequisites for continued world leadership which can be met partly through carefully conceived and effectively executed programs in international education.

* * * * *

The proper note on which to conclude this section on "Past Accomplishments, Present Realities and Future Needs," is to highlight several areas of "comparative advantage" for international education. These characteristics and potentialities of international education underscore the relevance of continued vigorous efforts in this field despite the countervailing pressures created by other urgent problems.

First, measured on the scale of government spending in general -- and in the area of foreign and military affairs in particular -- international education programs do not involve large sums of money. It can be convincingly argued that such investments build, at quite low cost, the enduring foundations of international understanding and amity. Here is a field where momentum could be sustained, and some advances made, with annual Federal support of only $100 to $150 million above the total funds available in Fiscal Year 1968. This is scarcely more than one-tenth of one percent of the 1969 Federal budget! (The citing of this figure of $100 to $150 million should not be interpreted as an exact reflection of needs. It is illustrative only.)

Second, as this country swings away from its past pattern of international involvement, as it experiences growing frustration over the relative inadequacy of traditional political, diplomatic and military means of furthering American interests in the world, the educational and cultural field may well become an area of enhanced opportunity. Other nations in the past -- notably Spain, France and now England -- have accompanied their relative decline in world power with intensified efforts on the educational, intellectual and communications fronts. And as the New York Times observed editorially in commenting on the reduction of the Fulbright Program budget: "The exchange of persons helped to keep lines of communication open in the dreariest days of the cold war; now the program is performing a similar service in countering the divisive effects of the Vietnam war."

The intent here is not to argue that activities in this area are directly substitutable for diplomatic, military and political instruments. It is only to suggest that the possibilities of exerting constructive American influence in the world through cooperative educational and cultural channels is proportionately greater, not less, in this era when the manageability of foreign affairs is on the wane for all the leading nations and world power is being sharply depolarized. Especially in such times, international education provides the United States with an avenue of active participation in world affairs. Given adequate funds and sufficiently imaginative institutions and arrangements, investments in these activities can redound to the benefit of all nations and to the great credit of the United States.

Third, there is the strong prospect that assistance in solving some of our most urgent domestic problems -- those of the cities, of poverty and of racial tension -- can be found in the experience and expertise accumulated through the involvement of Americans in international educational activities. This will not happen instantly nor automatically, but given the proper refinements in our conception and approach, we have here a large potential for sharing information and understanding on these problems among the nations.

Recent events at home and abroad have opened up the opportunity -- or more precisely, have dramatized the necessity -- for a systematic rethinking and redefinition of international education. A new conception is waiting to be born -- placing this field of activity in the mainstream of concern with the great problems facing men and societies everywhere. It can no longer remain what it was a decade or two ago, something special, apart, and designed for only the privileged few.

Such a reformulation of international education is beyond the scope and the possibilities of the present report. All that can be done here is to urge that the new patterns developed for federal efforts in this area retain sufficient flexibility so that they can be accommodated to a possible future reorientation of international education. As yet, we perceive only dimly the form and shape which this field may assume in the years immediately ahead. At the optimum, however, it will become a principal channel for cross-cultural sharing of experience and understanding, a chief means of collaborative attack on the most difficult problems common to societies everywhere.

IV. FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

A. Current Patterns: "Primary" and "Secondary" Agencies

The material in Appendix B should be reviewed before proceeding with this and subsequent sections of the present document. There one finds portrayed in chart form the activities of all federal agencies which reported international education programs, accompanied by certain explanatory notes on the data. This chart was compiled from summaries of the submissions made by the various agencies. Even these summaries run to dozens of pages of text and have not been included because of the easy availability of essentially the same program descriptions in the CU publication cited in The Notes of Appendix B.

Behind these summaries stands the complete documentation, constituting the full submissions from the 34 agencies which made affirmative responses to the inquiry concerning their participation in international education. This latter documentation is contained in looseleaf binders in six copies -- four in the Department of HEW and two retained in the offices of Education and World Affairs.

* * * * *

The first observation that emerges from reviewing the material in Appendix B is the large number and wide diversity of activities which the agencies themselves consider to fall under the rubric of "federal programs that have to do with educational activities aimed at international understanding and cooperation." The agencies are so numerous, the extent of their participation so uneven, and the character of their programs so varied -- that there are formidable difficulties in interpreting and analyzing their roles in this field.

Viewed historically, however, this situation should not be surprising: no concept of a coherent, coordinated federal effort inspired earlier program developments. On the contrary, the potpourri of activities which now form the landscape of international education in the federal government are the result of a series of independent moves, largely unrelated one to another, undertaken over the last 25 or 30 years. From the exchange program established by the Buenos Aires Convention of 1936 -- a convenient starting point for explicit federal involvement -- to more recent developments such as the Peace Corps and the International Education Act, each program had its own immediate motivations and purposes, its particular promoters and beneficiaries, its own justification in educational and foreign policy terms, and its own rationale of contribution to the national interest. These programs have lacked a broad framework to fit into and a consistent philosophy to undergird them. Only in recent years have we begun to interpret convincingly the role of international education in America's broader purposes in the world.

The material in Appendix B is such as to confront the analyst with a serious pitfall, that of settling for an encyclopedic treatment and thus failing to see the configuration of the forest for the multiciplicity and interesting variety of the trees. To find some means of ordering these data, the first step is to differentiate those agencies whose primary mission is not international from those which are clearly assigned the leading roles in this field. With all but ten of the 34 departments and agencies covered, their activities in international affairs are incidental to their principal responsibilities as determined by legislation and tradition. Whether it is in the training of foreign nationals by the Post Office Department, the loan of Treasury personnel for AID work abroad, or the scheduling of tour programs for foreign visitors by the Civil Service Commission -- in such cases international activities are manifestly secondary to the main agency missions.

An interesting commentary on the nature of the federal government's involvement in international activities emerges from this information. It is the fact that institutionalized contacts with the outside world are a part of practically every agency in Washington, a phenomenon that occurs independently of any articulated interest in, or established responsibility for, international education.

Here is revealed something so basic as the international outreach of virtually all segments of American society, in all their variety and complexity. When the Department of Commerce, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Department of Transportation and many others become involved in the international field, they serve as exponents of major elements and bodies of experience in American life. Indeed, as is noted elsewhere in this report, the active although limited participation of these "secondary" departments and agencies may be just as relevant to a reformulated conception of international education as are the more conventional activities of the "primary" agencies.

For the immediate purposes of this study, however, interest focuses on the "primary" agencies, those which have a formal mission related to foreign affairs, or in which substantial international activity has been coupled, over time, with what were originally domestic responsibilities. Of the ten"primary" agencies, six belong to the first category -- those with an explicit international mission:

-- Department of State; where general policy guidance originates with respect to the impact of activities in this field on the foreign policy and international position of the United States; whose Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU) is charged with major responsibility for educational and cultural exchange; whose Bureau of Public Affairs has a small program for furnishing materials on U.S. foreign relations to school systems in this country; which provides leadership for the interagency Foreign Area Research Coordination Group (FAR), a voluntary planning and coordination body; whose Research Council reviews all government-funded foreign affairs studies in the social sciences in terms of possible adverse implications abroad; and whose Office of Overseas Schools is concerned with the problems of American community and bi-national schools in other countries.

-- United States Information Agency; which manages the overseas libraries and bi-national centers; supports the corps of Cultural Affairs Officers serving in the embassies; handles part of the educational and cultural presentations program; supports a considerable portion of the government's English language teaching overseas (although several other agencies also participate); and has other scattered exchange activities.

-- Agency for International Development; where the role of education and the development process has been increasingly recognized in recent years and has been translated into substantial educational assistance activity, including provision of capital funds to the education sector and the assignment to overseas projects of U.S. specialist personnel (on direct hire, contract or borrowed from other agencies); where participant trainee components are part of many development programs (A.I.D.'s "foreign student" function); where some support is given to research on development related problems and to developing institutional capacity to plan administered foreign assistance programs; and where responsibility is lodged for U.S. assistance to such institutions as the American University at Beirut and the American University in Cairo.

-- Peace Corps; conducting programs in the less-developed countries under which young Americans, many of whom are technically trained, are sent abroad to work as volunteers in projects benefitting those countries and their people, more than half of the volunteers being engaged in teaching and other work in the field of education.

-- Department of Defense; whose training programs for foreign military personnel in the United States bring to this country the largest and least visible segment of our "foreign student" population; whose substantial support of overseas research on foreign areas in the social and behavioral sciences has raised one of the most complex sets of issues in this field; and whose large network of overseas schools for children of military personnel can be considered an important aspect of "international education" for Americans.

--Central Intelligence Agency; whose covert financing of various private voluntary agencies, some related to international education, was publicly disclosed in 1967 and thereafter was terminated by Presidential directive, effective at the end of 1967. (It is because of the special nature of this agency, the fact that there was no realistic possibility of obtaining data that could be published in an open report, and the termination of the agency's known participation in "international education," that information on CIA programs does not appear in Appendix B.)

The other four "primary" agencies are those in which substantial international activities have been added over time to what originally were essentially domestic responsibilities.

--United States Office of Education in the Department of HEW; which, despite its primary concern with the health and quality of education in the United States, has for many years had a certain international orientation through its Comparative Education Program; which has administered for the last ten years one of the important programs of federal support for international education in the colleges and universities (several parts of NDEA, especially Title VI concerned with Area and Language Centers); and where, within its large annual appropriations, funds for relevant international activities, especially with respect to research, are often available even when not so earmarked.

--Department of Agriculture; which has a special relationship to this field for both historical and contemporaneous reasons; historically, because it began sending agricultural technicians overseas for development assistance work even prior to Point Four and the initiation of the formal foreign aid programs; (Agriculture's professional personnel are, of course, still much involved in education-related work in foreign countries, directly, on loan to AID, and in other ways); and currently, because it is responsible for the sale of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities abroad whereby, under PL 480, U.S.-owned foreign currencies are generated, some of these funds being used for such international education activities as the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt programs.

--National Science Foundation; which has taken on a modest international orientation, making research funds available for work by foreign scientists and for projects conducted in the universities and laboratories of other countries; and where, as the Foundation's attention to the social and behavorial sciences has grown, opportunities for support of research on international problems in these fields have expanded correspondingly.

--Smithsonian Institution; originally a museum and research institution devoting itself to the advancement and diffusion of knowledge about American achievements and culture, now with substantial participation in international education, including operating responsibilities for certain scholarly, educational and cultural programs.

To reiterate, the respective roles and programs of these ten "primary" departments and agencies are the main focus of this report. It is assumed that under almost any adjustment or consolidation that might be undertaken, the "secondary" agencies would continue to participate in much the way they do today. But this is not necessarily true of the "primary" agencies since they inevitably cover the area where changes must be made if a more unified and coherent federal effort is to result.

The main question to be kept in mind as we move toward th recommendations in Sections V and VI of this report is this: what obstacles to a more effective national performance in thi area are attributable to the present pattern of agency roles and responsibilities. Again, our attention is directed to the ten "primary" agencies -- and more to some of them, of course, than to others. It is their activities which raise the major controversial issues occasioned by the federal government's involvement in international education.

B. *The Major Issues*

There are many serious policy problems that must be considered in arriving at sound recommendations for new patterns of agency responsibilities. Those discussed below do not constitute an exhaustive roster of such issues, but are clearly key matters on which future decisions must turn.

First, from a practical money standpoint, there is one ov arching question in connection with *any* proposals for "adjustm and consolidation." *What will the new balance sheet look like that is, what will the gains and losses be in the willingness the Executive to request, and of Congress to approve, appropri tions under any given new arrangement*. One argument -- not necessarily the decisive one -- for maintaining the *status qu* in the case of programs which have established a successful funding record with Congress is simply that they *do* have such a record. Major revisions might court the danger of upsettin the balance and, at least in the short run, seeing given programs suffer actual reductions in funds. Plans for the future should be calculated in the light of this possibility.

Second, to what extent can the United States advance its own basic purposes in the area of international education thr increased support of the multilateral and international lendi agencies? To what greater degree should they become the vehi of United States-supported educational cooperation efforts ab Although there is some reluctance to make dramatic increases the proportion of our technical assistance funds channeled through the multilateral and regional agencies -- perhaps on the assumption that we have less control and reap less "public relations" benefit -- this in fact may be a self-defeating, excessively short-run point of view.

To balance any such loss, if it should occur, there are several important advantages. First, the acceptability of assistance furnished by the major international entities -- the United Nations, the World Bank (IBRD), the Inter-American Bank (IDB), and others -- is higher in many less developed countries than is bilateral aid from an advanced nation. The latter has a history and reputation of "strings attached," tends to establish direct client relationships, drawing the recipient into a tacit alliance situation, and above all, is sometimes simply regarded as demeaning by the receiving country. Second, some international institutions, especially IBRD, enforce extremely high standards of planning and accountability on the part of the borrowers. And third, this approach opens up opportunities in appropriate situations for genuine "international education": in contrast to one-country efforts, multilateral aid can be based on systematic collaboration among the providers of capital and technical assistance, thus presumably drawing Americans into intimate colleague relationships at all levels with professionals of other countries.

This is not to suggest that multilateral agencies provide a panacea to solve most of our problems in this area. There are obvious limitations, from the standpoint of the focus of this report, including irrelevance to international studies on the campuses of America. Furthermore, multilateral assistance programs in general have not yet achieved the clarity of purpose and strength in programming that would be necessary before the United States would rely heavily on them. Nevertheless, the opportunities inherent in the multilateral approach should be carefully examined and suitably utilized as future patterns of action in this field are worked out.

Third, how can this nation solve the multiple dilemmas presented by accumulations of U.S.-owned surplus foreign currencies in certain other countries and harness larger portions of these funds to constructive international education efforts?

Generated in a number of countries by the sale of U.S.-supplied agricultural commodities under PL 480, The Food for Freedom Program and other efforts, these blocked balances present a mixture of problems and opportunities. The problems occur both in the United States and in the other countries. Congress has been reluctant to consider these funds as something separate and distinctive from dollar appropriations. Their use for education and related purposes has therefore been limited by the desire of Congress to hold expenditures at certain levels for particular agencies and activities. On the part of the countries themselves where these funds have accumulated, there has often been reluctance to release significant amounts for local expenditure. This is based partly on apprehension over their inflationary tendencies and partly out of fear that they will exercise a disruptive effect on national economic planning.

The most imaginative plan put forward with respect to this problem was that for a bi-national rupee foundation in India, to be endowed with funds representing a considerable portion of the U.S.-owned foreign currency in that country. One of the obstacles to implementation was the concern of the Indian government over establishing a large, independently-controlled source of economic power whose managers might function independently of the whole national planning process.

The opportunity inherent in these funds, of course, is that there are sufficiently large accumulations in some dozen countries of Europe, Africa and Asia to produce a strong positive impact on international educational programs -- if mutually agreeable means for their release could be worked out. So far this complex issue appears not to have been subject to the kind of comprehensive study that would give the Congress, the Executive Branch and interested parties in the private sector a full picture of the current situation and the issues involved. Systematic analysis and the spelling out of alternatives is a necessary next step. Only then can appropriate decisions be made for the constructive use of these funds, within the limits set by the power of Congress over appropriations and the national policies of other governments.

Fourth, given the American concept of democratic participation in foreign affairs and the fact that international education is an area where the role of private individuals and nongovernmental institutions is central, how can we improve the structuring of public-private relationships? This issue relates to both attitudes and money. The state of mind of scholars, teachers and students toward their government has a critical impact on the health and vitality of the public-private relationship. This reality is currently so much in the forefront of our attention -- in connection with such episodes as Project Camelot in 1965 and the CIA-centered disclosures of 1967 -- that it scarcely requires extended comment.

With respect to the use of public funds through private channels, we have not shown as much imagination or institutional inventiveness as often characterizes American performance. On the assumption that private groups effectively and legitimately serve public purposes, how can we devise flexible means of channeling public money into private hands for international education activities manifestly in the national interest? How can we mobilize the great strength of the private sector? How can private institutions and agencies be stimulated and facilitated in pursuing purposes *they* define as important and in the public interest, rather than simply becoming participants in *government* efforts or helping to advance explicit *foreign policy* aims? (This issue is intimately involved in the discussion appearing in the final section of this report.)

Fifth, to what extent should the inherent, natural relationships between the domestic and the overseas aspects of international education be reflected and reinforced in the assignment of roles and missions to the various federal agencies in this field? The tendency to maintain an unnatural dichotomy between the overseas and the domestic has been strengthened by the fact that the respective federal agencies (State, AID, USIA, Peace Corps, and Office of Education primarily) have dissimilar traditions and missions, distinct advisory groups, and different means and channels for relating to the private sector. Most important of all, their legislation and appropriations are handled by different committees and subcommittees within the Congress.

Although the separation is, of course, not absolute, there is still a wide opportunity to capitalize on the possibilities of mutual reinforcement between these major aspects of international education. Agencies with overseas responsibilities could be empowered to give more attention to sustaining the resource base at home, both for the training of people and the production of knowledge (as is the case with AID under Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act). Agencies whose primary responsibility relates to education and research in the United States could be granted more leeway to work with universities, research institutions, scholars and teachers in other lands. Just as the programs of NSF and NIH reflect this form of "internationalization," so the same principle could be applied more explicitly and generally to the Office of Education.

If by "exchange" we refer to a process that has implications and produces benefits both at home and abroad, then the responsibilities and programs of the federal agencies concerned should reflect this understanding.

Sixth, in attempting to "adjust and consolidate" the roles and programs of Federal agencies in order to achieve heightened effectiveness in this area, where should the balance be struck between the extensive pluralism we now have and the goal of greater concentration and coordination? One objective certainly is to get more mileage out of the same inputs. Some modification of the present scattered pattern, some drawing together of the various compatible elements of these programs, is indicated. But it would be unrealistic, and almost certainly counter-productive, to recommend that all, or even most, Federal programs in this area be assembled into a single monolithic agency, existing or proposed. The solution will have to be worked out in a much more hand-tailored way, step by step. Neither bureaucratic dogma, nor "ideological" doctrine, nor simple conservative "stand pattism" should be allowed to influence the final decisions on a new pattern. The important question of pluralism versus concentration is much involved in the last and most crucial issue to be highlighted in this report.

Finally, to what extent should the heavy involvement of the mission-oriented foreign affairs and military agencies -- State, AID, USIA, and Defense -- in international education be superseded by other arrangements that would signalize the educational, rather than foreign policy, meaning of these programs? Which programs of those agencies would be more acceptable and more effective if conducted under other auspices? This is an urgent question because it involves not only the attitudes of foreign peoples toward the United States, but equally the relationship of our own academic community to the federal government.

This issue, however, cannot be answered in general. It calls for a careful consideration of each agency and its present responsibilities.

State Department. Here one is concerned with the proper definition of State's role in educational affairs. Are the operating, almost foundation-like, activities of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU) congruent with the traditions, and even the atmosphere, of a department orientated toward non-program and non-action functions?

Some observers point to the symbolism of the relationship, believing that the major State Department role tends to cast our overseas educational exchange programs in the mold of an "instrument of foreign policy," much to our disadvantage. This, they argue, mixes political considerations into decisions that should be based on educational values. They also question the logic of giving the State Department responsibility for such distinctly educational ventures as the East-West Center and overseas American schools. The issue here is whether these functions should more appropriately be handled where they would enjoy greater insulation from immediate, day-to-day foreign policy pressure than is likely within State itself. If these activities were to be transferred, however, provision would have to be made for the Secretary of State, through the corresponding Assistant Secretary, to exercise general policy supervision and guidance -- a responsibility that cannot realistically be separated from that department.

Agency for International Development. The participation of AID in overseas educational activities presents a more complex problem. Here also there is perhaps some basis for concern over symbolism, since this agency is part of the State Department and is directly oriented to our major foreign policy goals. But there is a more serious dilemma. Over the last decade, in accord with sound developmental theory and a growing body of experience, AID has increasingly based its operations on the integrated-country-plan approach. Within this framework, attention to the educational systems of developing countries has assumed a logically important place. To diminish AID's role with respect to education would undercut both the theory and practice of developmental assistance as it has evolved over recent years. The other horn of the dilemma, however, is the fact that Congress has restricted the number of countries in which AID can conduct programs, and, in any event, it would not conform to the rationale of foreign assistance to sustain significant aid efforts in the relatively more advanced countries, already launched into self-sustaining development.

Rather than the impropriety of AID's role in international education, therefore, the important question is one of hiatus -- the need for AID-type efforts (cooperative programs for university-strengthening, for example) in countries where that agency is not functioning, and for low-key follow-up arrangements in countries where AID has phased out. At a minimum, the new pattern of federal effort in this field should take this need into account. It should also recognize the importance of Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, authorizing AID to help strengthen the resource base for technical assistance in U.S. universities. This is one of the few places in Congressional legislation where explicit recognition has been given to the need to build bridges between overseas programs and domestic requirements in educational cooperation.

Perhaps the most difficult question to be faced with respect to AID's role is the decline of that Agency's fortunes with the Congress, as foreign aid generally has become less acceptable to the American people. It is being widely predicted that the AID Agency will have to be rethought and reformulated within the next year or two. If that occurs, there will be an opportunity to consider in depth the questions raised here, sorting out the necessary authority that the new aid agency should have to function in the educational field from those activities which could better be handled at a location more removed from the Department of State as the foreign policy center of the government.

United States Information Agency. In the minds of some well-informed observers, USIA does not present so complex an issue as does AID. The question is simply what programs of a genuinely educational nature should be administered by that official agency charged with responsibility for the federal government's efforts on the information and media fronts -- activities which other countries tend to classify less euphemistically as "propaganda." USIA's role comes under review here mainly because of its responsibilities for U.S. overseas libraries and bi-national centers, English-language teaching, and management of the corps of Cultural Affairs Officers in the embassies. At the present time there may be no better placement for the libraries and centers than with USIA, although the possibility of the Library of Congress or the Smithsonian Institution as sponsor merits exploration. If, however, Option 3, described in Section V of this report, were adopted, then responsibility for overseas libraries and bi-national centers should be transferred to that new body.

The Cultural Affairs Officers present a serious problem, one that has been widely discussed in recent years (including extended consideration of the question by the Presidential Task Force established in 1965 after the Smithsonian speech). One cause of dissatisfaction with the present pattern is that it places the chief overseas representatives of U.S. education in a position subordinate to the Public Affairs Officers of the embassies, individuals who usually come from information and media backgrounds. This almost certainly inhibits the recruitment for these posts of educators of sufficient stature and experience to interpret our philosophy to other peoples, and to forge close professional ties with educational leaders and institutions of the other country. Since USIA is not particularly oriented to the U.S. educational community, there is naturally no tendency to develop genuine bonds of interest and understanding with academic leadership circles in the United States.

It must be emphasized that further dispassionate analysis of this problem, followed by a decision on the optimum arrangement for educational representation abroad, is a sine qua non of achieving effective "adjustment and consolidation" of federal activities in international education.

The Military Security Agencies. This issue of the association of international education activities with the mission-oriented foreign affairs agencies becomes most pointed in the case of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Defense.

With regard to CIA, matters have presumably been resolved by the termination of that agency's involvement in this area. But the nation is left with a residue of doubt and anxiety flowing from the February 1967 exposure of covert CIA financing of U.S. voluntary agencies functioning abroad. Several organizations which received such CIA support conducted programs which placed them clearly within the purview of this report. The 1967 disclosures had a serious impact both on the attitudes toward the United States in the leading intellectual circles of some, but not all, foreign countries, and in exciting suspicion and hostility among fellow members of the American academic community.

This CIA episode raised the issue in its starkest form of the scholar or student allowing himself to be used abroad, under cover of legitimate academic pursuits, as an actual instrument of American foreign policy and military interests. Obviously this is a nettlesome issue, one that is beyond the possibilities of this report to examine adequately. The key point for the immediate future, however, is that CIA's covert role was publicly acknowledged and then terminated at the end of 1967, by Presidential directive.

Obviously, for all the reasons that led to this stop-order by the President, safeguards should be established by the Congress to prevent any clandestine resumption of such CIA funding. The other side of the coin, however, is the need to provide a fully open, publicly-acknowledged and adequately funded base of support for U.S. voluntary agencies carrying out programs abroad in the national interest -- a matter to which we return in the concluding section of this report.

Defense Department. With respect to the Defense Department, however, the situation is still more complex. Defense support of research and other related educational activities, especially social and behavioral field research conducted in other countries under a "counter-insurgency" rubric, has been widely discussed in the mass media ever since the ill-fated Camelot episode in Chile during the summer of 1965. This became the subject of special hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in May of 1968, where a revealing picture was drawn of Defense's extensive involvement in this area.

The problem here arises out of the interaction among three key aspects of the present situation. First, at a time when government funds to support foreign area and international research are in short supply everywhere, Defense is the one agency disposing of large sums that can be made available for this purpose. Second, there is a positive side to Defense's interest in this field. Over the last 10 to 15 years, the department has come to recognize the importance, for its own strategic planning and performance, of knowledge about other societies which the social sciences can presumably furnish. This results largely from the great strides the military establishment has made -- through the advanced education of many of its officers in civilian universities -- in achieving sophistication in the analysis of national power and social dynamics. Defense therefore has a legitimate interest in the products of social and behavioral research with respect to other parts of the world.

Third, however, it is a simple truism that known Defense funding and/or sponsorship is often a severe handicap -- sometimes even the kiss of death -- for U.S. researchers seeking to investigate sensitive subjects in other countries. The hazard lies in thus explicitly identifying an American scholar with the promotion of U.S. strategic and military interests in relation to other countries. In the neutral and underdeveloped world, sensitivities on this issue are barely beneath the surface. To Indians or Chileans the appearances are so compromising that the reality of the scholar's motives almost ceases to matter. A small incident can produce disastrous consequences for the reputation of the American intellectual community and therefore for the stature of the United States generally.

This question becomes urgent for another reason. Future reinterpretations of international education are likely to emphasize cross-cultural work on a variety of concerns that are strictly in the domain of a country's internal domestic affairs. If the United States wants to preserve its bona fides and be in a position to collaborate openly and effectively with its friends in other lands on such subjects as the organization of universities, demographic problems, urban redevelopment, water and air pollution, and transportation -- then the reputation of American academics for scholarly independence, objectivity and integrity must be protected. How far can scholars go in doing field research overseas under Defense -- or perhaps even State Department -- auspices before this reputation is severly tarnished?

This dilemma -- the legitimate needs of the Defense Department for social science research, as against the dangers which Defense funding and sponsorship of private scholars poses for America's stature in the less developed world -- cannot be resolved by an extreme solution at either end of the spectrum. To divest Defense of its capacity to work with social scientists and support research in this field, would be counterproductive on several grounds. It would probably have the effect of simply reducing the total federal funds available for this kind of research, at a time when there is too little money in any event -- unless the Congress were willing to increase the budgets of other agencies, such as NSF and HEW, correspondingly!

Even if the overall level of funding could be maintained, a stringent prohibition on the Defense Department would still be unwise. It is critically important for our best national interests that independent social scientists be actively engaged in the analysis of military security questions. They should be in a position to contribute to Defense Department needs, but they should also function as well-informed critics of U.S. policies in the broad geopolitical area of defense strategy and national security policy.

Desirable as perhaps it would be to have this analytical and critical function performed by scholars who were completely divorced from Defense, this is not the way relationships tend to work in the real world. For their criticism to be informed and for their views to have impact, the outsiders must know a great deal about the dynamics of the inside. The research relationship is, after all, the background of the important role the hard scientists have achieved in defense matters. The same outcome is possible for the social and behavioral scientists, and for students of defense policy, but not until we have discovered a framework of relationships that protects the interests of both sides more effectively than anything now in sight.

Neither does an acceptable answer to this question of the Defense role in social research lie at the other end of the spectrum -- going blindly ahead under the present system as though no problem existed. This involves far too many obvious hazards, including one so far not mentioned. The prevailing attitudes of the social science community toward research collaboration with Defense severely limit the ability of that Department to attract high-calibre scholars to work with it. As a consequence, and by testimony of some of its own officials, Defense often does not get high quality products for its expenditures in this field: lower-calibre scholars are attracted, often lacking the sensitivities required for the tasks they embark on; research questions are poorly framed; significant subjects are overlooked; and in the end, the usual self-regulating, standard-enforcing procedures of serious scholarly research are not applied.

The answer can be found, however, by perceiving certain needs and opportunities on both sides -- while at the same time, recognizing candidly that the needs cannot be satisfied nor the opportunities seized unless a greatly improved model of relationships is designed. The first step is to distinguish clearly between a situation where, on the one hand, the Defense Department builds a broad open network of consultants, and directly commissions research projects, in order to get the kind of studies and information it needs; and, on the other hand, where Defense emerges as the largest source of funds in the federal government for overseas social science research. The latter situation is the one we now have; and it is not conducive to the best interests of that department, of the private research community, nor of the nation. The second step is to develop a healthier pluralism on this front by increasing the budgets, for this category of research, of federal agencies outside the military-intelligence establishment. With this kind of new pattern, Defense could properly gain that access to the social science community which is so necessary for the effective discharge of the critical responsibilities with which it is charged.

* * * * *

Among all the issues raised by an examination of the present pattern of federal agency activities in international education, that of determining the optimum role for the mission-oriented foreign and military affairs agencies is both the most crucial and the most complex. It has been argued throughout this section of the report that there is no simple, easy, all-at-one-fell-stroke solution. The degree of adjustment and consolidation that can realistically be recommended is limited, first by the importance of strong relationships to international affairs on the part of many agencies and departments of the government, and, second by the inevitable links to international education which characterize the mission-oriented foreign affairs agencies.

This is not a startlingly new or dramatic conclusion. But it points the only way the United States can move ahead effectively to give international education that place on its agenda of priorities which will enable us to realize the full potentialities of this field. The options, recommendations and proposals discussed in the last two sections of the report are based on this general assessment of where the nation stands today.

V. OPTIONS FOR THE SHORT-RUN

The preceding parts of this report constitute the backgro
necessary to assess what adjustment and consolidation of the a
ties of Federal agencies can be accomplished. In arriving at
final recommendations, we have taken into account the particul
set of relationships among the parties to the study. Educatio
and World Affairs undertook the preparation of this report at
request of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare who,
turn, was responding to a directive, incorporated in an Act of
Congress, that a comprehensive review be conducted of Federal
ties in international education. Thus HEW was both the depart
responsible for the study and also -- through the Office of Ed
-- one of the agencies centrally involved.

Given HEW's dual role, several things were indicated. It
especially important that EWA perform its assignment with the
plete objectivity that befits an independent private organizat
-- regardless of where the conclusions pointed with respect to
future role of HEW. At the same time, it was logical to focus
attention in the first instance on those changes which particu
involved HEW, separating out in the last section certain matte
that have broader implications for the entire federal governme
And finally, it was thought appropriate to present the recomme
tions in terms of three sets of options -- in effect, three le
of change, from modest, through intermediate to extensive -- r
than a single series of explicit proposals. Thus the way is l
open for those who must make the final decisions to compare th
costs and advantages of various courses of action.

General Considerations

The three options making up the body of this section are
based on certain general conclusions that were reached in the
of the study.

First, it is important to indicate what is not being reco
The study staff encountered no general demand, inside the gove
ment or out, for a sweeping reorganization of agency responsib
ties. Consequently, the concept of a wholesale reordering of
grams among federal agencies is not involved in the recommenda
This negative conclusion has a bearing on both the role of the
"secondary" agencies and the case for retaining certain intern
education activities in the mission-oriented foreign affairs a
on a case-by-case basis.

As noted earlier in the report, it is significant from both the philosophical and practical standpoints that the various "secondary" agencies have a role in international education. The responsibilities assigned to these departments and agencies represent virtually the full spectrum of problem areas in our national life -- whether it is transportation, regional development (the TVA), housing and urban affairs, movement of the mails, or the staffing of the federal bureaucracy (Civil Service Commission) -- American experience that may hold some value for the governments and peoples of other countries. It is generally agreed, furthermore, that the process of international education corresponds to a reciprocal flow of benefits along a two-way street. So with respect to those aspects of American society and economy represented by these federal bodies, there may be important lessons to be learned from abroad. Hence the rationale for "secondary" agency involvement is strong.

There is an analogous argument for having some of the mission-oriented agencies in the "primary" list retain certain responsibilities in this field. It may be important for an agency to have this authority because its involvement is necessary for the successful accomplishment of its main mission. Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act, for example, empowers AID to assist university programs in the United States when this is deemed essential for the supply of knowledge or personnel to support the Agency's primary mission in development assistance. For reasons of history, tradition, and technical competence, it would be hard to imagine moving the international education component of the Agriculture Department to some other location in the federal government. The importance for the Departments of State and Defense of ready access to the expertise of the academic community has been stressed earlier in this report.

It is not surprising that we find no drastic, stem-to-stern reorganization of international education in the federal government to be indicated. The pattern of dispersion, with "pieces of the action" located in many different quarters, corresponds to the picture presented by the "hard" sciences: their interests are represented in a variety of departments and agencies. Indeed, it is a fairly common phenomenon throughout the government.

If it is both inevitable, and also reasonable, that the 24 "secondary" agencies continue to participate in this field, then considerable importance attaches to the way interagency coordination is handled. Because "coordination" is so easy of prescription and so difficult of achievement, the treatment of this question is deferred to the last section of the report.

* * * * * *

In thinking about "adjustment and consolidation" in the short run, our interest lies with the ten "primary" agencies, and among those, especially with the six that have explicit international missions plus the Office of Education. Two of these six agencies, however, are omitted from the conclusions and recommendations: the Central Intelligence Agency, because its role as covert banker of certain activities in this field was deemed not to be in the national interest and was terminated by Presidential order; and the Peace Corps, because it is sui generis, a single-purpose agency with much of its activity in education, but a case where its functions are indivisible and to alter the present pattern would be to terminate, or radically transform, the activity itself.

Some of these same considerations apply to the Department of Agriculture, the Smithsonian Institution, and the National Science Foundation, agencies not among the six with traditional international missions. The Smithsonian is a unique organization whose participation in international education is logical and useful. The Smithsonian might well be given increased responsibilities in this field as relevant opportunities appear. In any case, it is not viewed as having activities which should be candidates for consolidation or relocation elsewhere.

The same conclusion obtains with the Agriculture Department, whose role in this field, as previously noted, is solid and historic. Agriculture's activities in international education tend to strengthen the department in the performance of its primary mission. At the same time, given the imperative of increased food production around the world, there is a strong case for the direct involvement of the Department of Agriculture as an agent and disseminator of education and technology in the food-deficient countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The international activities of the National Science Foundation reveal a pattern of involvement which is generic to the particular agency. Neither could the things NSF does on the international front logically be handled by other agencies, nor could it be seriously argued -- since science is inherently an international pursuit -- that the basic purposes of the NSF are not served by its grants and programs abroad.

By this process of elimination, the field is narrowed to those five agencies whose programs are necessarily involved in any effort at adjustment and consolidation: (1) the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU) of the State Department; (2) the United States Information Agency (USIA); (3) the Agency for International Development (AID); (4) the Department of Defense; and (5) the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, primarily the Office of Education (OE).

1. The case for possible relocation of responsibility for the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs' programs in international education -- which includes many of the government's exchange activities -- and for the East-West Center, has already been discussed in Section IV. It will therefore suffice to review briefly some of the questions that have been raised in the past: inappropriateness of conducting CU's foundation-like action programs in a non-action oriented department; the desirability of placing a layer of insulation between such genuinely educational activities and the conduct of American foreign policy on the diplomatic, political and military fronts; and the importance of finding a more suitable setting for these activities in order that constituency relationships with the American academic community can be more effectively developed.

The main non-CU activity of the State Department falling within the scope of this report is the Office of Overseas Schools, backing up the many American bi-national and community schools around the world. In any general redesign of agency responsibilities, a way should be found to relate this federal activity more closely to OE, the "educational heartland" of the federal government.

2. The problems presented by the United States Information Agency's responsibility for libraries and bi-national centers, the teaching of English overseas, and the Cultural Affairs Officers in the embassies has also been discussed in the "Major Issues" part of Section IV. The question here is not whether USIA has done an effective job in the discharge of these responsibilities -- most observers believe the agency has turned in a good performance -- but whether America's "image" in international education, the coherence of our efforts, and the building of strong constituency relationships, would not all be enhanced if these present USIA activities were placed under the aegis of the federal government's "education agency" instead of remaining with its "information" arm.

3. In the case of the Agency for International Development, uncertainty prevails as to the fate of the agency, and the size and form of the aid program under the new administration beginning in January 1969. For the purposes of this report, it can only be assumed that foreign assistance will continue in terms of roughly the same number of countries as at present, that the agency will follow its integrated country-plan approach, and that educational assistance, including participant training in the United States, will remain an important element. If these assumptions are borne out, the question will not be the inappropriateness of AID's involvement in international education, as far as it goes, but

rather the gap left by virtue of the philosophy, operations and coverage of the foreign assistance program. There will be a need for federal programs supporting AID-type educational relations with countries on the upper rungs of the development ladder, those which do not qualify for American assistance. There should also be programs to facilitate direct university-to-university cooperative arrangements outside the AID country plan, even in those nations where the agency functions. And of particular importance is the possibility of sustaining a series of low-profile educational efforts after AID has phased out of a particular country. These should take the form of relationships in research, teaching and service between American universities and institutions in other countries. New, highly flexible arrangements are needed, furthermore, to support the placement of U.S. academic personnel in the higher educational institutions of the developing countries, through the Fulbright program and by direct foreign-university hire, with U.S. topping-up funds.

With respect to AID itself (or its successor agency if one is created), the emphasis should be on the refinement of concepts, programming and administration, to assure effective performance and the building of sound relationships with the American academic community. Here the problem is not that of terminating, or finding a new home for, presently misplaced functions.

4. As has been indicated earlier in this report, the role of the Defense Department presents two special problems, one comparatively minor and the other serious. The former relates to the training of foreign military personnel in the United States, primarily at the war colleges and various military installations. (There were almost 8,500 such persons in training in the United States during Fiscal Year 1968.) Much of this training is presumably of a highly technical nature, so these "foreign students" represent a reasonable and proper involvement in international education by the military establishment. There seem to be no grounds for suggesting adjustment or consolidation of this activity or its relocation elsewhere in the government.

On the other hand, because so little is known publicly about the nature of the training given these armed forces representatives from other countries, there is room for doubt as to whether an impostant opportunity is being fully utilized. Even the casual observer of the international scene is aware of the critical position the military occupies in almost every country, especially in the underdeveloped world of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

There they often constitute the largest corps of highly trained and educated manpower. Given the potentially crucial role of military officers in their own countries, what happens to them during their training period in the United States becomes a matter of considerable moment. It is to be hoped that they are not simply instructed in the techniques of military organization and management and the handling of weapons. A proper strategy in this matter would call for combining their specific military training with other educational experiences in the colleges and universities, so that they would learn more about the United States and have a genuine opportunity to sample its educational offerings.

A specific recommendation is that, within the limits of military security requirements, this whole question be opened up for careful exploration by a combined panel of Defense officials and civilian educators and men of affairs. This group should be asked to suggest new programs to enable these military "foreign students" to enjoy as significant and well-rounded an educational experience, in proportion to the time available, as West Point cadets now receive during their four years of study at the Military Academy.

The more troublesome question in the bailiwick of the Defense Department will be reviewed briefly here because it has been elucidated in an earlier section of this report. This problem, of course, is Defense sponsorship and funding of social science, especially foreign area field research by university scholars. As was suggested earlier, this is not a black-and-white situation. Defense legitimately needs the contributions of the social sciences, particularly as they relate to understanding the dynamics of other countries. The United States, on the other hand, needs a group of scholars of integrity, independence and expertise to serve as the objective critics of national security policy, geopolitical strategy, and military spending, organization and effectiveness. The Defense Department cannot achieve the first, nor is it likely to be subject to the vigilance of the second, if it is entirely divested of its power to support research as one means of relating to the social science community.

It is therefore not a question of whether Defense should be involved in research support in this field, but rather how it should perform this function and what magnitude of funds it should dispose of for this purpose. There is a wide difference in the concern which informed citizens feel between, on the one hand, having the Defense Department pursue its legitimate purposes through the commissioning of research studies, assembling of panels of specialists, and the conduct of seminars and conferences, and, on the other hand, finding that Defense is, by a factor of four or five, the largest source of easily available funds for foreign area research.

The answer to this problem lies in simultaneous moves on several fronts. First, the State Department's Research Council should be strongly sustained in its review and clearance function to assure that overseas field investigations involving Defense Department funds pass muster as undertakings that will not affront the sensibilities of people in the less developed countries. Second, the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) -- the source within Defense of virtually all these funds -- should give vigorous attention to the enforcement of quality criteria for research by establishing panels of independent scholars to screen and approve project submissions. Third, the universities of the United States, as the main protagonists of scholarly integrity and high research standards, should use every influence at their command to impress their faculty members with the hazards created for the entire teaching and research profession by casualness -- or worse still, by dissembling -- in the use of Defense Department funds for work in other countries. Finally, limitations might be set on the level of funds Defense is authorized to expend in this area -- but only if the federal government, especially the Congress, were prepared to adopt simultaneously a multiple-funding-sources strategy. This would require an increase of federal funds available for research in these same areas, through such other agencies as the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, the Arts and Humanities Foundation, and the Office of Education.

If such a concerted attack were mounted on this problem, simultaneously from all fronts, one of the most disturbing issues in the entire area of federal activities in international education would be well on its way to resolution. Furthermore, this question of the dominant (and sometimes prejudicial) role of Defense in supporting social science research abroad could be handled independently of the other recommendations embodied in the three options set forth below.

5. The pivotal agency from the standpoint of possible adjustments and consolidations of federal programs in this area is the U.S. Office of Education (OE). This is partly because the primary concern of OE is with "the condition and progress of education in the several states and territories," in short, the quality of education available to Americans. It is also because our most pressing national need in this area is, as previously discussed, the achievement of full national literacy in world affairs, the

growth of the nation's pool of specialized, highly trained manpower -- the teachers, scholars and practitioners we shall need in ever-increasing numbers -- and the expansion through research of America's intellectual capital and store of knowledge on international affairs. Such needs almost automatically place the Office of Education in the center of future planning.

Limitations of time and space make it impossible to present in detail the history of OE's role in international education. Through its Comparative Education Program, until recently located in the Bureau of Research, OE has long had an identification with this field. The base from which the Office's future role will develop is comprised mainly of its responsibility over the last ten years for Title VI of the National Defense Education Act (providing support for Language and Area Centers in the Universities, now administered by the Division of Foreign Studies, made part of the recently-created Institute of International Studies), and its intended role as the home of the International Education Act, recently extended for two years by the Congress as an amendment to the Higher Education Act.

During 1966-1967, it was planned that the Center for Educational Cooperation -- the "focal point of leadership" for the new efforts in this field proposed in the President's February 2, 1966, message to Congress -- would be located in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. This was decided, not because the Office of the Secretary was a logical or traditional locus for such operating activities, but because in some quarters it was felt that OE was not yet in a position to take on these responsibilities. This judgment stemmed from the traditional view of the Office of Education as mainly linked with the elementary and secondary school level and dominated by the "schoolmen" who were not in close touch with the mainstreams of U.S. higher education. Had the Center been established and the International Education Act funded, the actual grant-making and other authorized operations would presumably have been handled by the Center within the Office of the Secretary.

As the prospects for these appropriations grew dimmer during 1968, it was decided to bring together the various international education activities of HEW in a new Institute of International Studies, established within the Office of Education. This reflects, among other things, the new situation wherein OE's relations with the higher educational community have been strengthened as its overall annual budget has grown toward the four billion mark. Negatively, this decision confirms the unsuitability of placing such educational operating functions in the office of the Secretary who presides over health and welfare as well as education.

Thus, in terms of the traditional responsibilities of agencies, the major attention of this report focuses on the Office of Education. And in the light of recent developments, OE's new Institute of International Studies assumes considerable importance -- both for what it represents today and for the potentiality it holds for the future. It must be recognized, however, that if the Office of Education, through this institute, is to function as a center of consolidation for various federal activities in international education, as suggested in two of the sets of options which follow, it will have to be substantially strengthened in several directions. For the Institute to become a major voice for international education, it will also have to be vested with a certain "critical mass" of new responsibilities. Simply to move small pieces of the federal effort to the Institute, to have it grow episodically without plan and by accretion, would deny it the possibility of becoming a real center of strength for federal interests in this field. The three options which conclude the present section of the report are based on this assessment.

There is a further reason for holding to the pattern now established and strengthening the Office of Education to become the nation's "focal point of leadership," in preference to placing such functions in the Office of the Secretary of HEW. A far-reaching reorganization of that department has been widely discussed in the upper eschelons of Washington for several years. Apparently the two leading possibilities are, first, the creation of three new cabinet level departments for, respectively, education, health and welfare; and second, adoption of a "Pentagon pattern": separate sub-cabinet departments for each of these three areas, the entire complex presided over by a Cabinet level secretary as at present. Regardless of which reorganizational route is followed, the recommendation to center international education in OE would be congruent with the future pattern. It would provide the basis for a new federal Department of Education to develop from the outset a strong international dimension.

* * * * *

The principal "candidates" for adjustment and consolidation of federal international education activities are, of course, the programs and agencies discussed in the preceding pages of this section. To suggest the range of choices available to the Executive branch and the Congress, the various moves that might be made are arranged in a series of graduated options, representing a sequence from the most modest to the most extreme changes.

OPTION 1: Concentrate on improvement of individual federal programs in international education without any significant relocation of activities or establishment of new institutional arrangements.

This would be a "strengthen-in-place" answer to the adjustment and consolidation question. It would reflect, among other things, a belief that the mood of the country and of the Congress would not support any major departures or innovations in this field during the next year or so. The underlying assumption would be that the greatest net gain would be achieved by leaving all programs essentially intact, located where they now are, especially those which have enjoyed a stable and successful funding relationship with the Congress.

Under this option, the traditional roles of CU, AID and USIA would be unchanged, with effort concentrated on program refinements and improvements. Within this option, it would still be possible and desirable, however, to undertake the following moves:

1. Thoroughly reevaluate the Fulbright-Hays Program, utilizing the breadth and flexibility of the basic legislation to make certain changes in operating policies and procedures and thus to make this program a more effective vehicle for educational exchanges. Desirable modifications should be formulated by a task force which would review the present guidelines and format of the program from the standpoints of its competitiveness with other approaches, and projected U.S. needs in international exchanges and educational development assistance over the next decade. The program needs considerably increased funding levels, especially in view of recent cuts, and this review would provide the basis for asking the Congress to take a fresh look at the whole Fulbright appropriations picture.

2. A similar review and exposition of the situation with respect to all excess U.S.-owned foreign currencies, could be expected to clarify a question not now widely understood (i.e. what the full potentiality is and what the limitations are for the allocation of these funds to international educational activities), and to lay the foundation for larger appropriations in this category, and greater flexibility of approach in the future.

3. In order to achieve genuine, long-run international collaboration in educational cooperation efforts, make use of the multilateral organizations and lending agencies to the extent justified by the effectiveness of their procedures and performance.

4. Continue to strengthen the clearance and coordination arrangements for overseas research already developed by the Stat Department's Research Council and follow a multiple-funding-sour strategy in this area of federal financing by increasing the opp tunity for social science research scholars to receive support f other relevant agencies of the government in addition to the Def Department.

5. With respect to the Office of Education, strengthen its new Institute of International Studies and continue efforts to gain appropriations for the support of international studies in the universities, colleges, and schools through the recently extended International Education Act.

Under this option, the present pattern of agency involvemen in international education would persist much as it is reflected in Section IV and in Appendix B of this report. A modest approa this option would probably not respond fully to the desire for "adjustment and consolidation."

OPTION 2: Undertake the moves suggested in Option 1, but g beyond them to implement fully the strategy already embodied in the new Institute of International Studies for Office-of-Educati wide attention to international education, by supporting the Ins tute strongly with adequate personnel and budget, and by providi it with a public advisory committee of experienced, prominent citizens similar to the never-activated National Advisory Commit on International Studies authorized by the IEA of 1966.

The proposal here is similar to that of Option 1 in that no major relocation of programs or reassignment of responsibilities would be contemplated. It differs, however, in proposing that t more prominent role of the Office of Education portended by the establishment of the Institute of International Studies, be full supported with adequate budget and staff so that its potential role in OE can be fully realized. This would result in the devel ment of a systematic strategy to make appropriate use of all avai able education legislation to meet the United States' top priori needs in international education: national literacy, specialize manpower development, and research.

In addition to the extended International Education Act, th are a number of other legislative authorities which should recei attention. With the notable exception of Title VI of NDEA, howe most of them are neither labeled "international" nor usually considered from the standpoint of their possible contributions to t field. It is nevertheless true that with respect to the Higher Education Act -- especially Title III for the support "Developing Institutions" -- the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and now the new Education Professions Development Act -- the legislative authority can be interpreted to include the building of an international dimension in U.S. education at all levels: universities, colleges, junior colleges, teacher-training institutions, and schools.

Those interested in the development of international programs in American education, however, can be made aware of the potentiality of these pieces of "domestic" legislation, only as The Institute becomes a strong "strategy center" within OE. Its role should be, on the one hand, to develop a convincing case for increased funding under the explicitly international acts and authorities -- such as the International Education Act, Title VI, of NDEA, and the Comparative Education Program -- and to work out guidelines on OE policies and procedures for grant applicants so that all possible advantage can be taken of the large omnibus legislative acts.

The underlying philosophy of this approach is that international education, as it is pursued in the curricula and on the campuses of American schools and colleges, is of the very essence of education itself, not a separate and special thing. Thus an awareness of the international dimensions of education at every level can be effectively woven through the fabric of the Office of Education, stimulated by the "strategy center" in the Institute of International Studies.

As part of such a consolidation of effort in OE, two other important needs should be considered. The first is to assure -- given the extensive support which the federal government now renders to education of almost every type and level -- that adult and continuing education, and professional retraining, do not escape concentrated attention. In an era of rapid change, it is critically important that there be programs which enable Americans to move in and out of the educational process as their needs and opportunities dictate. This is relevant to the main thrust of the report because such educational efforts should, insofar as possible, include a strong international component.

One of the genuine anomalies in the pattern of federal agency involvement in international education is the support of elementary and secondary schools overseas by, on the one hand, the Office of Overseas Schools in the State Department, and, on the other hand, the Department of Defense with its network of Dependents' Schools. The paradox is not simply that these two mission-oriented foreign and military affairs agencies should operate school systems, but rather that no significant liaison seems to have been developed between these schools and that agency of government, OE, which has primary responsibility for the health of elementary and secondary education in this country.

It is probably not practicable, at least in terms of this option, to move responsibility for Defense's Dependents' Schools or the support of American bi-national and community schools overseas, to the Office of Education. But short of such actual relocation of authority, means should be sought to forge closer relationships between these schools and the heartland of American public education at home, and especially to make them eligible for OE support through the various relevant titles of the Elementary and Secondary Act, the Vocational Education Act and others.

(The closest parallel of an activity misplaced by its location in the State Department, is the support of the East-West Center in Hawaii. Inasmuch as this is a responsibility which should properly be transferred to the Office of Education, however, it falls under Option 3.)

OPTION 3: Assuming the strengthening of the Office of Education and its Institute of International Studies as suggested in Option 2, such that this agency becomes a real "focal point of leadership" for federal activities in international education and therefore a strong base to which certain highly relevant functions could be transferred, then undertake those shifts of program responsibility that would represent a consolidation of effort in terms of the general principles of the federal government's approach to international education as advanced earlier in this report.

This option embodies the most extreme approach to adjustment and consolidation recommended in the report, largely because the role envisaged for the Office of Education is considerably enlarged beyond the traditional place this agency has occupied in international education. But if we could shut out for a moment the schematic arrangement of federal agency responsibilities which has become familiar over the years, there is no inherently logical reason that OE could not take on certain functions now located elsewhere.

In assessing the viability of this approach, it must be remembered that OE already performs certain activities of a CU or AID type under contract with those agencies, or through specific legislative authority. Such relocation of responsibilities would in any event require that the Office of Education be strengthened in staff, resources and outreach to the point where it could handle them effectively. To accomplish this rearrangement, new legislation and appropriate executive orders would probably be required and transfers of personnel would have to be authorized. Within HEW, and especially within OE itself, there would have to be dedication and commitment to the international dimensions of education going beyond anything known there up to this time.

If these requirements were satisfied by the Department of HEW and the Office of Education, additional "adjustment and consolidation" measures could be undertaken that would add up to the "critical mass" OE must have in order to discharge effectively its enlarged new responsibilities. In addition to the question of overseas schools as discussed in Option 2, OE could then have transferred to it the following programs and functions:

-- the educational exchange programs and responsibilities of the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, with the qualification that there should remain a central point in State for policy guidance and coordination with respect to those activities directly impinging on U.S. foreign policy, presumably in the office of an Assistant Secretary of State for this area.

-- responsibility for the East-West Center in Hawaii, now vested in the State Department.

-- the overseas library and bi-national centers program of USIA.

-- the coordination and/or management of English language teaching abroad.

-- the "housing and care" of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO (now lodged in the State Department).

-- the backup and support, from the standpoint of the U.S. academic community, of a new corps of Education Officers to serve in embassies abroad, at the level of the Public Affairs Officers rather than subordinate to them. (These officers would probably be under the direction of the Department of State while at their posts overseas, inasmuch as they would belong to the "country team" headed by the Ambassador.)

As the highest level of response to the expressed desire for "adjustment and consolidation," this option would raise a number of important details for further decision as plans were implemented. The panoply of advisory groups, for example, should be reviewed and necessary changes made to produce greater simplicity and clarity in this area. It is recognized, furthermore, that to propose a more direct role for the Office of Education in overseas matters would require considerable change in our pattern of thinking about this area, as well as in public images and channels of communication. But it is not fundamentally illogical for OE to move in this direction in the 1970s when we remember that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor, to mention only two, have long-established, widely-accepted roles paralleling that suggested here for the education agency.

* * * * *

The essential meaning of these recommendations, under three separate sets of options, is that there is no other preferable and feasible means of achieving substantial adjustment and consolidation except to base it on the U.S. Office of Education. The only alternatives would be to establish a new coordinating mechanism in the federal government or create a quasi-public instrumentality, related to the Office of Education but specifically empowered to encourage, support and manage a variety of educationally-related overseas programs. It is even doubtful that these are alternatives to Option 3; they are probably supplementary. In any event, as indicated earlier in this report, such proposals are deemed to fall outside the main purview of this study. Rather than include specific recommendations on these matters, therefore, the various parameters of the problem are discussed in the next and concluding section of this report.

VI. DIRECTIONS FOR THE LONGER RUN

The pattern suggested in Option 3 would represent a considerable degree of adjustment and consolidation of federal activities in international education. It would place the United States in a substantially stronger position to accomplish its objectives more efficiently and expeditiously. This represents about as far as the specific recommendations of the report should go. More extensive changes and innovations will probably not be feasible for the next year or two.

There remain for future consideration by the Executive Branch and the Congress, however, two important matters. The purpose of this concluding section is to suggest some of the parameters of these questions.

The first is interagency coordination, a need that should be kept under continuing review because many federal agencies now have -- and even more may have in the future -- some degree of participation in international education. Many of the departments and agencies now have assistant secretaries responsible for the international interests of the department, or special offices or bureaus to handle such matters. The objective of coordination would be to maintain a "rolling balance" of effort in this field, to guard against unnecessary duplication and conflicting directions in agency efforts, and to achieve, not absolute symmetry and harmony, but a reasonable level of coherence.

Coordination raises the issue of whether it is to be based on a "top-down" or a "bottom-up" approach. The latter points to the need for the private sector constituency having already achieved a reasonable degree of rational organization in its own right. Individuals and organizations making up the primary interest groups must be thoroughly familiar with the issues which make coordination necessary; must accept a give-and-take attitude; and must be prepared to accept and abide by the coordinating arrangement. It is open to reasonable doubt whether the private sector involved in international education meets this criterion.

"Top-down" coordination takes various forms. One angle that seems to have received less than its due share of attention in the current federal picture is the degree of interagency coordination that could be achieved through the powers of initiation, program planning and presentation, information collection and inquiry and reporting. This latter concept of "review and report to Congress" on the full situation among the agencies was to have been the basis of influence for the never-activated National Advisory Committee for International Studies authorized in the International Education Act of 1966. It is obvious that any interagency mechanism could be effective under this theory of coordination only to the extent that it enjoyed clearly specified authority, adequate funds, and a strong staff.

The mechanism of the present Interagency Council for Educational and Cultural Affairs should be examined from the standpoint of its being sufficiently strengthened to meet the requirements of a coordinating mechanism. To correspond to the shift in focus from the traditional foreign policy orientation to a new educational emphasis in international education, reflected in the Option 3 changes, the chairmanship should be vested elsewhere than in the Department of State where it is presently located.

If the federal Interagency Council approach were retained and strengthened, leadership responsibility might well be vested in the Secretary of HEW or perhaps in the Executive Office of the President. If this function is to be effectively discharged from HEW, the Office of the Secretary of that department would have to be appropriately staffed and oriented. It is believed that the Secretary's Office is not now so organized and would probably not be capable of performing the coordination function at the highest levels of government, vis-a-vis other departments concerned. There would presumably have to be a "presence" in the Office of the HEW Secretary -- perhaps a Special Assistant for this purpose -- to assure that the necessary initiatives were taken within the Department. Thus support would have to be given fully and systematically from this quarter to the role of OE in international education, much as this is now apparently done for the Public Health Service with respect to other federal agencies in the fields of medicine, health and biological sciences. The important point here is simply that if interagency coordination is to become an HEW responsibility, the requisite interest, knowledge and commitment must be reflected in the staffing, organization and functioning of the Office of the Secretary.

As the full pattern of international involvement by federal agencies unfolds over the years ahead, it might prove desirable to consider coordination at a higher level, establishing an Executive Office level special assessment and coordinating body. This might be called the Federal Council on International Programs and would be essentially a strategy and priority-setting board. Made up of both public and private members and reporting to the President, it would conduct a continuing review of the total government effort in this area, would make public reports and appropriate recommendations to the Budget Bureau and the President. Possibly this Council should incorporate the present FAR overseas research coordinating mechanism now located in the State Department. It would perhaps be an analogue to the Office of Science and Technology. In any event, its stated purpose would be to achieve a highly concerted and coordinated effort on both the overseas and domestic fronts of international education. It should be noted, finally, that this issue of coordination is distinct and largely separable from the remaining question of future need for a new quasi-public instrumentality.

This other question focuses on whether even the changes proposed in Option 3 would provide an adequately flexible arrangement for relating the government to the full spectrum of private sector initiative and activity. Would we perhaps still fall short of having the conceptual framework and institutional arrangements necessary to tap the rich resources of energy, motivation and expertise of private citizens and organizations?

It is fundamentally in response to this aspect of the public-private relationship that the idea of a new quasi-public instrumentality in the international field has been a recurring motif for the last decade or longer. In the various public studies and reports bearing on our present area of concern published during the last 10 to 15 years, there is no note sounded so persistently and repetitively as the call for a new "public-private" agency.* Although the prescriptions as to type, size, shape and location of agency vary, there appears to be a consensus among the recognized spokesmen for this field that some kind of flexible new mechanism is needed.

Perhaps the most important consideration is the need to provide a "home," rallying point, supporter and stimulator for the voluntary agencies in international affairs. The strong and effective work that such agencies do reflects what might be called the "native American style" in this field. At their best

*See Appendix C

they represent and project in other lands one of the strongest and most admirable characteristics of American life. Whether in the field of adult education, rural cooperatives or village development, they are a low-cost, high-yield form of endeavor. As the CIA-funding episode of 1967 showed, as President Alan Pifer of Carnegie has argued persuasively in two of his Annual Report essays -- here is a great potential force that we have no means of supporting adequately or bringing into fully effective public service. Not just to take care of the so-called "CIA-orphans," but to capitalize on a major national resource, a new quasi-public instrumentality should become the vigorous headquarters of U.S. private voluntarism applied to international affairs.

To detail the specifications of the new mechanism goes far beyond the scope of this report. Considerable study and deliberation would be required to settle the many difficult questions and thorny issues; this is probably a job that should be assigned to a special Presidential task force. To suggest the general nature and tone of the organization, however, the following are important characteristics:

-- It should be chartered by the Congress, and through its board or in other ways, a special relationship with the legislature should be established, so that Members of Congress would feel it was "their" organization as much as that of the Executive Branch -- although in fact it would be the "wholly-owned subsidiary" of neither.

-- Its independence and integrity would be assured through the appointment to its board of citizens of the highest prestige and experience, thus giving the new entity a position of great unassailability.

-- It should be semi-independent or fully autonomous in relation to the federal government.

-- Its financial base should be a combination of some private money with very substantial public funds.

-- It should be allowed a high degree of flexibility in program and operations, approaching as nearly as U.S. practices will allow, the model of the British Council.

-- It should be empowered to deal with institutions, organizations and individuals in the United States and in other countries.

-- It should be capable of supporting long-range programs and efforts and therefore should be provided with no-year funds by the Congress.

-- It should be insulated from short-run foreign policy considerations not only by its being "situated" remote from the foreign-military-intelligence agencies, but also by there deliberately not being assigned to it any highly political type of programs. (It should be expected to function in terms of educational and cultural criteria, not political ones.)

-- It should have the power to grant funds, to conduct operations, and both to carry on in-house research and to support research activities outside.

An agency possessing these characteristics may seem unattainable -- but anything much less independent or less capable of attracting high-quality staff and both public and private funds will not be able to fill the largest gap of all in this field: to release the enormous energy and potential of American private voluntarism.

On the other hand, to guard against the danger of this new instrumentality appearing a completely open-ended operation, functioning all across the board without standards and criteria, it would be essential to begin on a modest basis, giving careful attention to the definition of program, setting of priorities, and establishment of evaluating procedures.

* * * * *

The immediate prospects for creating this kind of mechanism do not appear bright, but the time may well arrive in a few years when it will become feasible. In the meantime, it should be the subject of careful study and creative design efforts. Whatever planning is done in the short-run on a new instrumentality, there is no inconsistency in proceeding vigorously at the same time with the adjustments and consolidations recommended in Option 3.

If eventually this piece of "institution building in the United States" can be accomplished, it will open up bright prospects for the future of American educational involvement on the world scene. It could provide the leverage to move this country up to a new level of sophistication and effectiveness by strengthening the role of the private sector generally and by emphasizing the people-to-people meaning which is at the heart of international education.

EWA/WWM:ew
March 24, 1969

DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE:
Federal Programs in Education Designed to Improve International Understanding and Cooperation

Appendix A

CONDUCT OF STUDY AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

EDUCATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10036

CONDUCT OF STUDY AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was carried out under contract between Educatio
and World Affairs and the Department of Health, Education and W
Its terms of reference were the following provisions in the App
priations Act for Fiscal Year 1968, directing the Secretary of
to carry out:

> "--a comprehensive study of all authorized Federal programs that have to do with educational activities aimed at improved international understanding and cooperation, with the objective of determining the extent of adjustment and consolidation of these programs that is desirable in order that their objectives may be more efficiently and expeditiously accomplished--"

The work was in every sense a collaborative effort between
and EWA. The first step was to establish contact with the seve
departments and agencies of the federal government whose progra
constituted the substance of the study. Mr. Ralph Flynt, Deput
Assistant Secretary of HEW for International Education, wrote t
those departments, referring to the survey of their internation
education activities recently conducted by the Bureau of Educat
and Cultural Affairs of the State Department (in preparation fo
what became the publication "A Guide to U.S. Government Agencie
Involved in International Education and Cultural Activities,"
Department of State Publication number 8405) requesting them to
amplify and update the information previously submitted to Stat
Each agency was asked to designate a contact officer so that the
study staff could have someone through whom to obtain additional
data and fill in gaps in coverage.

Mr. Flynt set up a special office for the three-man HEW sta
assigned to work with EWA. Miss Janice Johnson and Mr. David Ho
of the Department of HEW, and Mr. John Sartorius, on special ass
ment to HEW from the Woodrow Wilson School of Foreign Affairs of
University of Virginia, constituted this group.

In addition to receiving the submissions made by the variou
departments and agencies in response to Mr. Flynt's letter and t
accompanying questionnaire, it was necessary for the HEW staff t
go back to most of the agencies (in some cases, to have personal
interviews and make contact a number of times) in order to get f
information on their relevant activities. The other task primar

handled by the HEW staff in Washington was the initial identification, summary and analysis of the various public reports making up Appendix C. Although this work was finally completed by the EWA staff in New York and the grid chart at the beginning of Appendix C was done in New York, much of the basic work had been accomplished by the HEW group in Washington.

Miss Margie Reinhart was responsible for the analysis and organization of the agency program data which resulted in the summary charts of Appendix B. Mrs. Patricia Huntington completed the reviews of major reports and their presentation in the form appearing in Appendix C. Peter N. Gillingham, Joel L. Johnson and David B. Arnold, Executive Associates in the New York office of EWA, and Andre E. Rheault, Director of EWA's Washington office, all undertook assignments in connection with this study. Mr. Gillingham made special investigations of two important problems within the area of the study -- the role of the Defense Department in overseas research, and the use of PL 480 and other U.S.-owned foreign currencies. Mr. Johnson dealt with the role of the multilateral agencies and international lending institutions. These special pieces of work were of great importance as a basis for the analysis and recommendations of the report. Messrs. Arnold and Rheault, the former in New York and the latter in Washington, were responsible for general coordination and liaison as the study proceeded.

Special mention should be made of the contributions of two individuals who served as consultants to EWA in the course of the study: Mr. Steven Muller, Vice President for Public Affairs of Cornell University, and Professor Richard Snyder of the University of California at Irvine. Both were active in producing relevant memoranda and in making themselves available on numerous occasions for extended conversations with the Project Director and other staff members.

In order to gain the advantage of the thinking and experience of members of Congress in connection with international education -- and also to enable the project staff to sense the legislature's attitudes and anticipations -- a number of interviews were arranged with key members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. At the same time, direct discussions were held with the heads or their representatives of the primary federal agencies involved in the study: the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the State Department, AID, USIA, Department of HEW, Office of Education, Bureau of the Budget; and also with persons intimately familiar with the situation in both the Department of Defense and the Central

Intelligence Agency. In both the Legislative and Executive branches, these contacts were made on the part of EWA by one or more of the following four individuals: Mr. Herman B Wells, Chairman of the EWA Board of Trustees; William W. Marvel, Project Director; and Messrs. Andre Rheault and Peter Gillingham, the last name serving as organizer and coordinator of the interviews.

A review conference on the first draft of the report was organized by Education and World Affairs at the Hotel Biltmore in New York City on September 16. This meeting was attended by a distinguished group of educators and men of public affairs, all widely experienced in the matters under discussion. (The conference participants are listed at the end of this appendix.) The draft had been circulated to the conferees beforehand, and in the course of three long working sessions -- morning, afternoon and following dinner -- all aspects of the analysis and recommendations were carefully reviewed. The Project Director felt that this was one of the most stimulating and fruitful sessions of its kind he had ever attended. Full notes were taken and many of the suggestions made by the conferees were used in the substantial redrafting which produced the present report.

* * * * *

The Project Director wishes to take this occasion to express his thanks to all who participated in one phase or another of the study and contributed so fully to the final product. Appreciation is extended to those specifically mentioned in this Appendix, Deputy Assistant Secretary Flynt, the members of the study staff at both HEW and EWA, the two consultants, Messrs. Muller and Snyder, the members of the Executive and Legislative branches who were helpful in discussing various aspects of the study with EWA representatives, the conferees at the September 16th meeting, and the secretaries at EWA who assisted with that meeting and who performed so well under forced draft in completing both the preliminary and final versions of the report: Arceil Amodio, Marilyn Berry, Brenda Klein, Catherine Murphy, Karen Slater, Mary Swalling, Ellen Welch, and Stephanie Young.

As will be understood from references in the opening paragraphs of the report, despite the indispensable help rendered EWA by many individuals in the course of the last few months, final responsibility for the accuracy of the information, the analysis and commentary on federal programs, and the recommendations for change, is assumed by Education and World Affairs itself.

EWA/WWM:ew
October 1968

PARTICIPANTS IN SEPTEMBER 16, 1968 WORKING CONFERENCE ON THE REPORT

Vincent Barnett
President
Colgate University

The Honorable Lynn Bartlett
Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

David E. Bell
Vice President
The Ford Foundation

John Caldwell
Chancellor
North Carolina State
The University of North Carolina
Raleigh, North Carolina

William Carey
Assistant Director
Bureau of the Budget
Washington, D.C.

Douglass Cater
Special Assistant to the President
The White House

Francis J. Colligan
Executive Director
Council on International
Education and Cultural Affairs
Department of State

Jack Dalton
Dean
School of Library Service
Columbia University

Curtis Farrar
Deputy Assistant Administrator
for Program and Policy
Agency for International
Development

John Fisher
Executive Secretary
Modern Language Association

Ralph C. M. Flynt
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
International Education
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Herbert Fredman
Assistant Director
USIA Information Centers

Shelton Granger
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
International Affairs
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Michael Harris
President
Franklin Books Programs

James Hobbs
Assistant to the Under Secretary
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

David Hohman
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Kenneth Holland
President
Institute for International
Education

Harold Howe, II
Commissioner
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Janice Johnson
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Bryant Kearl
Acting Chancellor
The University of Wisconsin -
Madison, Wisconsin

Robert Leestma
Assistant Commissioner and
Director
Institute of International
Studies
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

Paul Miller
Professor of Education
University of North Carolina
Charlotte, North Carolina

Steven Muller
Vice President for Public Affairs
Cornell University

James A. Perkins
President
Cornell University

Frank Rose
President
University of Alabama

Richard C. Snyder
Professor of Administration
and Political Science
University of California
Irvine, California

Glen Taggart
President
Utah State University

Logan Wilson
President
American Council on Education

Harris Wofford
President
State University College of
Old Westbury
Planting Fields Campus, Box 540
Oyster Bay, New York

DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE:
Federal Programs in Education Designed to Improve International Understanding and Cooperation

Appendix B

SYNOPSIS OF FEDERAL AGENCY PROGRAMS

1. Notes
2. Numbered List of Agencies Submitting Responses
3. Summary Chart

EDUCATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10036

1. Notes on Appendix B

1. The materials submitted by the agencies were summarized on the attached chart for convenience of quick review and to make rough comparisons possible. This classification of programs should not be overinterpreted as it is not intended to be a definitive presentation. It represents only an approximation of the present pattern of federal agency programs.

2. Anyone not familiar with the actual programs of these federal agencies may wish to refer to available program descriptions. Considerable material of this kind was, of course, assembled in the course of the study -- and is available to anyone wishing to consult it. But we have not included summaries or synopses of the programs in the Appendix because this information is easily available in the September 1968 publication of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, "A Guide to U.S. Government Agencies Involved in International Educational and Cultural Activities." This Department of State publication #8405, International Information and Cultural Series #97 is available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

3. No attempt has been made in the chart that follows nor in the text of the report to derive overall totals, either in dollars, numbers of persons, or numbers of programs for the full range of federal agency activity. Such totals would be almost meaningless because of the disparity of programs and the different interpretations and reporting procedures from one agency to another. In assembling this information, it became clear that many agencies did not sort out their activities in such a way as to make it possible to put an "international" label on all relevant programs. Some agencies did not submit statistics at all. For these same reasons, the totals indicated for various individual agency programs are suggestive rather than definitive.

4. One important factor tending to produce double reporting-- and contributing to inaccuracies on the high side in any effort to present total dollar or people figures -- is the prevalence of reimbursed programs and interagency contractual arrangements. This is particularly true as between the Office of Education on the one hand and AID and CU of State on the other hand, but is also found with respect to a number of other agencies.

5. The functional categories to which the columns on the chart correspond represent a compromise. They are adequate for the sorts of activities engaged in by the "secondary" agencies, but do not reflect so accurately the nature of all activities in the case of such "primary" agencies as CU of State, Department of Defense, Office of Education and Peace Corps. For example, activities classified here as study and research opportunities for U.S. citizens and formal training opportunities for foreign nationals are often structured within "exchange programs" according to agency classification.

6. It is difficult to distinguish precisely between "training of foreign nationals' and "programming of foreign visitors." Visitor programs are often considered training opportunities by the agencies concerned, but in other cases consist of only orientation sessions conducted by those agencies.

7. Although it is not specifically identified anywhere on the summary chart -- it is apparently subsumed under other program titles -- the teaching of English overseas is supported by a number of the "primary" agencies. This may well be the most highly dispersed single activity covered in this study.

8. The training programs reported by the "secondary" agencies are mainly conducted in the United States. Those of the "primary" agencies, however, usually include activities both in the U.S. and overseas, and are often not distinguishable from "technical assistance."

2. Numbered List of Agencies Submitting Responses

A. AGENCIES WITH MAJOR BUDGETS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

A-1 Office of Education
A-2 Agency for International Development
A-3 Department of Defense
A-4 Department of State (CU)
A-5 National Science Foundation
A-6 Peace Corps
A-7 Department of Agriculture
A-8 Smithsonian Institution
A-9 United States Information Agency

B. AGENCIES WITH MINOR BUDGETS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

B-10 Public Health Service
B-11 Veterans Administration
B-12 Atomic Energy Commission
B-13 National Foundation on Arts and Humanities

C. AGENCIES WITH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS BUDGETED BY OUTSIDE SOURCES

C-14 National Academy of Sciences
C-15 Department of the Interior
C-16 Department of the Treasury
C-17 Department of Labor
C-18 Department of Commerce
C-19 Tennessee Valley Authority
C-20 Social Security Administration
C-21 Social & Rehabilitation Service
C-22 Post Office
C-23 Federal Communications Commission
C-24 Department of Housing & Urban Development
C-25 Civil Service Commission
C-26 Library of Congress
C-27 Department of Transportation

D. AGENCIES WITH NO SPECIFIC BUDGET FIGURES FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

D-28 Department of Justice
D-29 Bureau of the Budget
D-30 Federal Reserve System
D-31 Civil Aeronautics Board
D-32 National Aeronautics & Space Administration
D-33 National Archives & Records Service
D-34 Government Printing Office

A. AGENCIES WITH MAJOR BUDGETS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
(1968 figures unless otherwise indicated)

AGENCY	Research and Study	Training Foreign Nationals in US & Abroad	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
A-1 OFFICE OF EDUCATION	Comparative Education Prg $164,905 (OE) 219,063 (PL480) 15,000 (AID/PASA) Persons served: 25,000 U.S. thru publications, consultation, etc. ----------------- Fulbright-Hays sec 102 b $3,000,000 (OE) 100,000 (PL480) Persons: 173 U.S. 15 foreign nationals + 31 group projects ----------------- Language & Area Centers $5,830,000 (OE) Persons: 5468 (1967 figure) Centers: 106	Educ. Exch. & Coop. Prog. primarily to foreign nationals & countries $842,275 (Dept. State) 58,460 (host country contrib) 298,200 (for. curr. not PL480) Persons: 497 Countries: 57 --------------- Technical Training Prog. $1,013,632 (AID) Persons: 407 -------------- Ryukyuan Training Prog. $29,785 (Army) Persons: 19 ---------------- Teacher Exchange Prog. $46,660 (Dept. State) $1,812,000 (host country contrib.) Persons: 356		Foreign Visitor Program $'s not specified 2 prof & 2 secretaries supported by OE for this program Persons: 984 secondary & non-grant -------------- Educational Materials Center $'s not specified AID & CU support 3 staff people for the visitor program Persons: 780	Coop. Intern'l Activities Intern'l Org. Recruitment $262,627 (OE) involved with 25 NGO org. in 1968 ---------------- Statistical Clearinghouse $23,835 (Dept. State) ---------------- Institutes for Advanced Study Title XI NDEA $5,307,087 (OE) Persons: 3078

A. AGENCIES WITH MAJOR BUDGETS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
(1968 figures unless otherwise indicated) (cont'd.)

AGENCY	Research and Study	Training Foreign Nationals in US & Abroad	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
A-2 AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	Research-Institutional Grants Program to US Institutions $7,350,000 (AID) Grants: 10 Research-Develop Research (War on Hunger) $7,457,266 (AID)	Participant Training Prog. $4,717,200* (AID)	Development Loan Fund $92,400,000 (AID) (education projects figures) Countries: Supporting Assistance Programs $15,400,000 (AID) (educational purposes figures) American Schools & Hospitals $11,067,000 (AID) some of this may be foreign currency Technical consultation & support $3,256,000* (AID) U.S. University Contracts $231,175,739* (AID) Universities: 122		

*Breakdowns of Technical Assistance Program which has total of $297,000,000

A. AGENCIES WITH MAJOR BUDGETS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
(1968 figures unless otherwise indicated) (cont'd.)

AGENCY	Research and Study	Training Foreign Nationals in US & Abroad	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
A-3 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE	Defense Lang. Institute $16,031,027 (DoD) Persons: 2,516 foreign 8,979 U.S.	Military Assistance Program $55,269,000(DoD) Persons: 19,267 (8,493 trained in US) ---------- Foreign Students at US Service Academies $'s not specified Persons: 50 Countries: 19 ---------- Ryukyuan Training Prog. $1,257,000 (DoD) Persons: 763			Foreign Area Specialist Training Program $140,206 (DoD) "in-country trng." Persons: 30 U.S. ($'s available only for the 3rd country trng.) ---------- Overseas Dependent Schools $93,500,000 Schools: 166,135
A-4 DEPARTMENT OF STATE BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL & CULTURAL AFFAIRS (N.B. U.S. Sources of funds cannot be broken down w/in prog. $43,763,000 (CU) 943,389(reserve funds) 368,192(war debt) 1,668,811(host country) 89,608 (counterpart)	Exchange Prog-Students foreign grants $5,806,782 1,765,991(for.curr.) U.S. grants 408,934 2,220,278 (for.curr.) Persons: 906 U.S. 2,517 foreign ---------- continued	Observation & Consultation(Leaders) $4,245,655 1,191,678(for.curr.) Persons: 1,182 ---------- Specialists Trng.Prog. foreign grants $699,615 333,128(for.curr.) U.S. grants $554,866 329,718(for.curr.) Persons: 329 foreign 232 U.S. ---------- continued		Visitor Program Educational Travel foreign grants $843,733 624,196(for.curr.) U.S. grants 7,387 31,628(for.curr.) Persons: 896 For. 18 U.S.	Aid to American-Sponsored Schools Abroad $2,053,000 Countries: 55 ---------- Cultural Presentations $1,600,000 Countries: 97 cult.pres. 18 sports pres. ---------- Multilateral Org.Activities $462,038* * US contrib. to intern'l org. in Bureau of Int. Org. Affairs

A. AGENCIES WITH MAJOR BUDGETS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

(1968 figures unless otherwise indicated) (cont'd.)

AGENCY	Research and Study	Training Foreign Nationals in US & Abroad	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
A-4 DEPARTMENT OF STATE BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL & CULTURAL AFFAIRS (CONT'D.)	Exchange Prg.-Teachers foreign grants $1,256,291 485,544 (for.curr.) U.S. grants 382,062 588,611(for.curr.) Persons: 698 foreign 248 U.S.	Contracted Programs with Org. & federal agencies $3,001,770 (Org.) 636,000 (federal agencies)			
	Research Exchange Prog. foreign grants $690,632 452,497 (for.curr.) U.S. grants 86,420 798,747 (for.curr.) Persons: 323 for. 157 U.S. University Lecturers foreign grants $296,555 252,137 (for.curr.) U.S. grants 1,220,761 3,856,147 (for.curr.) Persons: 279 for. 528 U.S.	Research and Study (Cont'd.) Grant-in-Aid Mutual Exch. $2,215,191 (1967 figure) East-West Center Program $5,220,000 (AID provides funds for special projects)			

A. AGENCIES WITH MAJOR BUDGETS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

(1968 figures unless otherwise indicated) (cont'd.)

AGENCY	Research and Study	Training Foreign Nationals in US & Abroad	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
A-5 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION	Research - Visiting Foreign Lecturer $121,460 (NSF) Lecturers: 12 Research Senior For.Sc.Fellow $650,000 (NSF) Persons: 65 Research - Advance Science Seminars $79,115 (NSF) Persons: 90 U.S. Research - Dissertation Research Grants $222,400 (NSF) Persons: 54 Research- Econ.& Manpower Study foreign sc. $98,132 (NSF) Research - Science Educ.Devel. $5,448,250 (NSF) (1967 Figure) Research - Facilities Ovseas. $29,700 (NSF)	Supplementary Teacher Trng. (foreign nationals participate in the U.S. program) $93,016 (NSF) Persons: 125 foreign Countries: 35	Indian Science Prog. $1,007,352 (AID) Central Amer. Sc. Educ. Prog. $39,400 (AID) Tech.Coop. Prog. $91,500 (AID)	—	Intern'l. Travel to mtgs. $2,471 (NSF) Persons: 6 Intern'l.Travel Grants $391,066 (NSF) Persons: 698 Liaison with Intn'l.Org. $410,350 (NSF)
		Research & Study (cont'd.)	Research & Study (cont'd.)	Research & Study (cont'd.)	
		Research - Translation of for.educ.public. $14,901 (HEW PL 480) Fellowships Abroad $1,283,497 (NSF) Persons: 151 U.S. Research- NATO Fellowships $323,201 (NATO) Persons: 52	Research-NATO Advanced Study Institutes $42,351(NSF) Persons: 77 Research-US-Italy Coop. Sc. $134,415 (NSF) U.S.-Japan Coop.Sci. $442,008 (NSF) Persons: 28 Mutual Exch.w/ E. Europe $327,190 (NSF)	U.S.-India Exchange $8,724 (NSF) Persons: 7 Intern'l.Projects Research $8,543,926 (NSF) Awards: 173(1967 Fig.) Research-Cerro Tololo Inter-Amer.Observatory $2,325,000 (NSF)	

A. AGENCIES WITH MAJOR BUDGETS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

(1968 figures unless otherwise indicated) (cont'd.)

AGENCY	Research and Study	Training Foreign Nationals in US & Abroad	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
A-6 PEACE CORPS			Basic Technical Assistance Program $48,500,000 (PC) (includes excess & near-excess curr.) 1,900,000 (host country) Persons: 7,484* U.S. *1967		Pre-Service Training $26,800,000 (PC) Persons: 7,600 U.S. - est. School Partnership $175,000 (PC) -admin. Projects: 668
A-7 DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE		Agriculture Training in U.S. $1,640,000 (AID) Persons: 4206-estimate Countries: 115	Counsel on Agric.Devel. $8,270,000 (AID) Persons: 416 U.S. Countries: 45		
A-8 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION	Research-Foreign Currency Program $2,316,000 (PL480) Research no $'s specified 6 foreign scholars 66-67				Intern'l. Exch. of Publications $108,000 (Smith.) Traveling Exhibition in U.S. no $'s appropriated-income from rental & sales

A. AGENCIES WITH MAJOR BUDGETS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
(1968 figures unless otherwise indicated)(cont'd.)

AGENCY	Research and Study	Training Foreign Nationals in US & Abroad	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
A-9 UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY					Salaries, exhibition & radio facilities $185,264,000 (USIA) 8,991,000 (spec.for.curr.) 4,249,000 (CU) 1,573,000 (Dept.State) 589,000 (AID) 468,000 (other) 2,870,000 (non-fed) Broadcasting Serv.Abroad $32,736,027 (USIA) (authorized) 107,770 (for.curr.) Inform.Center Serv.abroad $6,088,835 (USIA) 547,322 (for.curr.) Inf.Center Exhibitions abroad $2,709,000 (USIA) 387,000 (for.curr.) Motion Picture & TV abroad $10,256,983 (USIA) Press & Pub.Serv.abroad $12,281,265 (USIA) 11,270 (for.curr.) Overseas Operations & Installations $65,692,121 (USIA) 10,023,918 (for.curr.) Overseas Posts: 364

B. AGENCIES WITH MINOR BUDGETS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

(1968 figures unless otherwise indicated)

AGENCY	Research and Study	Training Foreign Nationals in US & Abroad	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
B-10 U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (HEW)	Research Program with all components of PHS $15,000,000 (PL 480) Projects: 134 Countries: 32 U.S. Fellows Abroad $2,022,000* (PHS) Persons: 252* NIH Center for Collaborative Research $2,360,000* (PHS) NIH Post-Doctoral Prog. $1,200,000 (PHS) Persons: 176*	NIH Training Program $1,150,000* (AID) Persons: 207* Food & Drug Admin. Program $'s not specified Persons: 235 Countries: 61		NIH Visitor Program $1,315,000 (PHS) Persons: 144*	
B-11 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION					U.S. veterans of Korean War Study Abroad $2,250,000 (VA) Persons: 1266

*1967 figures

B. AGENCIES WITH MINOR BUDGETS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS
(1968 figures unless otherwise indicated) (cont'd.)

A G E N C Y	Research and Study	Training Foreign Nationals in US & Abroad	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
B-12 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION	Assignments at AEC Facilities $'s from for.contracts Persons: 452 Puerto Rico Nuclear Ctr. $2,112,000 (AEC) 220,000 (Interoceanic Canal Commission) Persons: 167 foreign 46 U.S.				Intern'l. Exhibits $990,000 (AEC)-est. Countries: 8 Film Libraries O'seas $43,000 (AEC) Depository Libraries O'seas $97,000 (AEC) Depositories: 79 Countries: 56
B-13 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES	Endowment for Humanities Fellows $401,520* (Endow) Persons: 114* + 4 grants that were intern'l. *estimates of % that was international				Endowment for the Arts Intern'l. Coop. Programs $82,000 (Endow.)

C. AGENCIES WITH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS BUDGETTED FROM AID OR OTHER OUTSIDE FUNDS

AGENCY	Research & Study	Training Foreign Nationals (mainly in U.S.)	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
C-14 NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES	Fulbright Exchange $1,281,183 (CU) Persons: 979*foreign 688*U.S. NASA Doctoral Program $3,225,000 (NASA) Persons: 108 foreign 61 U.S. NASA Fellows in Space Sc. $176,000 (NASA)-estimate $250,000 (coop.countries) Persons: 66 foreign Countries: 14 Army Visit.Research Assoc. $150,000 (Army) Persons: 8 foreign 1 U.S. Smithsonian Visit. Research Associates $210,000(Smithsonian) Persons: 9 foreign 7 U.S. Mutual Exch. w/E.Europe $327,190 (NSF) *1967 figures	Atomic Energy Program $299,657 (AID)-estimate Persons: 81 + 26 UN sponsored Countries: 28	Science Books Program $167,110 (AID) 100,000 (foreign) Countries: 10		

C. AGENCIES WITH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS BUDGETED FROM AID OR OTHER OUTSIDE FUNDS (CONT'D.)

AGENCY	Research & Study	Training Foreign Nationals (mainly in U.S.)	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
C-15 DEPT. OF THE INTERIOR	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Prog. $70,000 (AID) 2 yr.grant Country: Philippines U.S. Fish & Wildlife Prog. $40,000 (AID) 2 yr.grant Country: Mexico U.S. Fish & Wildlife Seminar $2,500 (FAO-UN) Office of Saline Water Desalting Program $19,800,000 (Interior) 707,218 (foreign contract)	U.S.Fish & Wildlife Econ. Dev. $90,000 (AID) Persons: 37 Nat'l.Park Serv.Prog** $252,073 (AID) 1,770 (CU) Persons: 175-estimate Nat'l.Park Serv.Afric. Stud. $4,000 (AID) Persons: 15 Nat'l.Park Serv.Admin. Course $3,000 (AID) 3,500 (CU) 12,000 (Priv.fndtns.) Persons: 8 + 27 non-grant Bureau of Reclamation Admin.Trng.Prog. $123,000 (AID) 28,000 (non-fed.) Persons: 102 (see visitor statistic in column 4) **includes some training abroad	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Specialist $22,000 (AID) Countries: E. African Bureau of Land Management Prog. $47,647 (AID) Persons: 1 foreign 1 U.S. Training Foreign Nationals mainly in U.S. (cont'd.) Geological Survey Branch Institutional Dev. Prog. $125,280 (AID) Persons: 92 Countries: 25	Bureau of Reclamation Persons: 300	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Translation of Science $'s PL 480 Nat'l.Park Serv.Coop. Natural Resources Dev. $6,000 (Interior) Country: Japan Nat'l.Park Service Exch. of Persons $10,625 (Interior)

C. AGENCIES WITH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS BUDGETED FROM AID OR OTHER OUTSIDE FUNDS (CONT'D.)

A G E N C Y	Research & Study	Training Foreign Nationals (mainly in U.S.)	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
C-16 DEPT. OF TREASURY		Bureau of Customs $38,000 (AID) Persons; 163 Countries: 32 Internal Revenue Service $113,705 (AID) Persons: 87 Countries: 13 Treasury Law Enforcement Prog. (foreign trng.incidental)	Bureau of Customs $71,200 (AID) Persons: 25 Customs staff Countries: 9		
C-17 DEPT. OF LABOR		Labor-Management Prog. $2,415,125 (AID) Persons: 215-estimate	Technical Assistance Program $300,000 (AID) Persons: 74 Dept.of Labor Staff	150 Visitors (non-grant) no $'s specified	Exch.& Inf. Program $507,150 (CU) Persons: 160 (foreign); 20 U.S. Inf. Serv. O'seas. $217,061 (USIA)
C-18 DEPT. OF COMMERCE		Bus.Economics Prog. $32,800 (AID) Persons: 45		224 visitors in Census Bureau orientation prog.	
		Census Bureau Prog. $743,000 (AID) Persons: 287 (see visitor statistics in column 4)	Trng.For.Nationals (mainly in U.S.)(cont'd) Environmental Sci.Prog.* $83,378 (AID) Persons: 14 *also involves research	(cont'd.) Maritime Admin. Program $37,350 (AID) Persons: 30	

C. AGENCIES WITH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS BUDGETED FROM AID OR OTHER OUTSIDE FUNDS (CONT'D.)

A G E N C Y	Research & Study	Training Foreign Nationals (mainly in U.S.)	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
C-19 TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY		Fertilizer Program $58,850 (AID) Persons: 72 Countries: 28		Visitor Program $ 90,800 (TVA) 20,000 (reimbursed by AID) Persons: 2500* Countries: 118* *1967 figures	
C-20 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (HEW)		2-9 month trng.prog. included in visitor program column 4	SSA staff overseas 4 AID sponsored 4 non-AID sponsored (see $'s in column 4)	Orientation Prog.to SSA $75,365 (AID) 96,324 (SSA) Persons: 418	
C-21 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE	Cooperative Research Program $5,000,000 (PL480) Grants: 46 Countries: 9 Interchange of Experts $181,000 (PL480) 93,722 (SRS) Persons: 36 foreign 37 U.S.	SRS Training Program $151,050 (AID) Persons: 570 Countries: 66			
C-22 POST OFFICE		Trng.& Exchange Prog. $44,940 (AID) Persons: 147			Universal Postal Union $66,000 (P.O.)

C. AGENCIES WITH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS BUDGETED FROM AID OR OTHER OUTSIDE FUNDS (CONT'D.)

A G E N C Y	Research & Study	Training Foreign Nationals (mainly in U.S.)	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
C-23 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION		Telecommunications Develop. $17,235 (AID from Intern'l. Communications Union) Persons: 24 (see visitor statistics in column 4)		54 Visitors	
C-24 DEPT. OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT		HUD Training Program $210,000 (AID) 450 (UN) 175,000 (HUD) Persons: 1198			
C-25 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION				Orientation to CSC $'s Staff Salary GS-13 and GS-5(CSC) Persons: 250 Countries: 50	U.S. Exec. Seminar $16,650 reimbursed by participants Persons: 38 Library Exchange $'s insignificant
C-26 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS				Non-grant visitors $300 (Dept.of State) Library of Congress $'s not specified Persons: 2800	Acq. Foreign Public. $5,000,000 (HEW) Acq. Foreign Public. $2,229,443 (PL480) Persons: 149 foreign 9 U.S. Exch.of Publications $'s not specified 2,350 exchanges w/ intern'l. org.

C. AGENCIES WITH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS BUDGETED FROM AID OR OTHER OUTSIDE FUNDS (CONT'D.)

A G E N C Y	Research & Study	Training Foreign Nationals (mainly in U.S.)	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
C-27 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION		Federal Aviation Administration $344,700 (AID) 147,000 (For.Govt.) Persons: 266 Countries: 41 Bureau of Pub. Roads Admin.& Training $147,000 (AID) U.S. Coast Guard $10,000 (annual transfer from AID) other $'s not specified Persons: 51 Countries: 19	Bureau of Pub.Roads Overseas Technicians $2,416,815 (AID) 172,267 (Iran Export-Import Bank)	Bureau of Pub.Roads $'s in fellowships not specified Persons: 389 Countries: 53	

D. AGENCIES WITH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS BUT NO SPECIFIC BUDGET FIGURES
(1968 figures unless otherwise specified)

A G E N C Y	Research & Study	Training Foreign Nationals (mainly in U.S.)	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
D-28 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE		Bureau of Narcotics & Dangerous Drugs Prog. $'s not specific foreign participants included in general program			

D. AGENCIES WITH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS BUT NO SPECIFIC BUDGET FIGURES
(1968 figures unless otherwise specified)

A G E N C Y	Research & Study	Training Foreign Nationals (mainly in U.S.)	Technical Assistance Abroad	Prog. Foreign Visitors	Other Programs
D-29 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT BUREAU OF THE BUDGET				Foreign visitors Prog. on an ad hoc basis $'s not specified Persons: 136 Countries: 39	
D-30 FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM				For.Visitors Prog. on ad hoc basis $'s not specified Persons: 305 Countries: 86	
D-31 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD			Civil Aeronautic Specialists $'s not available Persons: 2	For.Visitors Prog. $'s not specified Persons: 6	Participates and advises on international aviation
D-32 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS & SPACE ADMINISTRATION	Research Program described under NAS	NASA Trng.Prog. $'s from for.sponsor Persons: 37 Countries: 3			
D-33 NATIONAL ARCHIVES & RECORDS SERVICE		Trng.Prog.in cooperation with Univ. & on request of for.countries		For.Visitors Prog. no statistics available	
D-34 GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					has international sale of publications no statistics available

DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE:
Federal Programs in Education Designed to
Improve International Understanding and Cooperation

Appendix C

MAJOR RELEVANT REPORTS, 1949-1968: APPROACHES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

EDUCATION AND WORLD AFFAIRS
522 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036

LIST OF STUDIES IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

An asterik (*) indicates a study which appears on the grid following this list. The unmarked studies contain information not directly pertinent to the grid topics.

*1. Bundy, Harvey H. and James Grafton Rogers. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS. A report with recommendations for the U.S. Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, Herbert Hoover, chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949. p. 1.

*2. REPORT ON AMERICAN OVERSEAS EDUCATION. The Operations Coordinating Board, Harold D. Hoskins, chairman. Washington, D.C.: October 29, 1954. p. 2.

3. FEDERAL ACTIVITY IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION. Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, 83rd Congress. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955. p. 5.

4. REPORT ON OVERSEAS ECONOMIC OPERATIONS. A report prepared for the U.S. Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government by the Task Force on Overseas Economic Operations, Herbert Hoover, chairman. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955. p. 6.

5. Morrill, James L. A PROPOSAL FOR THE COORDINATION OF THE EXCHANGE OF PERSONS PROGRAMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE SERVICE AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION. Washington, D.C.: Department of State, 1956. p. 7.

6. GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION (A SURVEY AND HANDBOOK). Forty-second report of the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 2d Session. House Report No, 2712. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959. p. 9.

7. Cater, Douglass C. WORLD PROGRESS THROUGH EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE: THE STORY OF A CONFERENCE. Report of the Third National Conference on Exchange of Persons. New York: Institute of International Education, 1959. p. 9.

*8. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION. Office of Education staff paper. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1960. p. 10.

*9. THE UNIVERSITY AND WORLD AFFAIRS. Report of The Committee on the University and World Affairs, J. L. Morrill, chairman. New York: The Ford Foundation, 1960. p. 11.

*10. REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON "EXCHANGE OF PERSONS." James M. Davis, chairman. Ann Arbor: The International Center, University of Michigan, 1961 (mimeo). p. 15.

*11. EXTRACTS FROM THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION ACTIVITIES ABROAD. Mansfield D. Sprague, chairman. Washington, D.C.: December, 1960 (mimeo). p. 20.

*12. Laves, Walter H. C. TOWARD A NATIONAL EFFORT IN INTERNATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS. A report prepared at the request of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 23.

*13. Amendment to Section No. 621 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (PL 87-195), known as the Humphrey Amendment. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 29.

14. Coombs, Philip H. STRENGTHENING THE EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL COMPONENT OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY: A REPORT TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE. Washington, D.C.: June 5, 1962. p. 30.

15. Haviland, H. Field, Jr. "Federal Programs of International Education." HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT edited by Charles G. Dobbins. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963, pp. 76-88. p. 31.

16. BEACON OF HOPE. Report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963. p. 33.

*17. IDEOLOGICAL OPERATIONS AND FOREIGN POLICY. Report No. 2 on Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive. Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 2d Session. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964. p. 34.

*18. Coombs, Philip H. THE FOURTH DIMENSION OF FOREIGN POLICY: EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS. New York: Harper & Row, 1964. p. 37.

*19. Gardner, John W. AID AND THE UNIVERSITIES. New York: Education and World Affairs, April. 1964. p. 39.

*20. THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION: A NEW INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964. p. 44.

21. THE COLLEGE AND WORLD AFFAIRS. Report of The Committee on the College and World Affairs, John W. Nason, chairman. New York: Education and World Affairs (for the Hazen Foundation), 1964. p. 47.

22. Fraser, Stewart (ed.). GOVERNMENTAL POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: A SYMPOSIUM. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965. p. 47.

*23. Coombs, Philip H. "Ways to Improve United States Foreign Education Aid." EDUCATION AND FOREIGN AID, by Philip H. Coombs and Karl W. Bigelow. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965, pp. 3-42. p. 48.

*24. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CULTURE AND INTELLECTUAL EXCHANGE. Prepared by the National Citizens' Commission on Intellectual Cooperation for The White House Conference on International Cooperation, Washington, D.C., November 28-December 1, 1965. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965. p. 50.

25. Johnson, Walter, and Francis J. Colligan. THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM: A HISTORY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965. p. 52.

*26. Frankel, Charles. THE NEGLECTED ASPECT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS: AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL POLICY ABROAD. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1966. p. 52.

*27. "International Education and Health." Message from the President of the United States. U.S. House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2d Session. House Document No. 375. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966. p. 55.

28. Michie, Allan A. (ed.). DIVERSITY AND INTERDEPENDENCE THROUGH INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION. A report on a symposium marking the twentieth anniversary of the International Educational Exchange (Fulbright) Program, sponsored by The Board of Foreign Scholarships and co-sponsored by The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, The Johnson Foundation and Education and World Affairs, held in New York City, September 1966. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1967. p. 58.

29. STUDY OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION. Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 1st Session. House Document No. 193. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968. p. 60.

*30. FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS, July 1, 1966-June 30, 1967. Joseph R. Smiley, chairman. 90th Congress, 2d Session. House Document No. 252. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968. p. 61.

Important Prpposals	A new agency for intn'l ed. and cultural affairs	New position w/in existing Gov. structure for ed. & cult'l affrs.	Ed. officers connected to U.S. embassies abroad	Greater cooperation with international organizations	Use resources of gov. agencies other than Dept. of State to conduct intn'l. ed. & cultural affairs	Appropriations	Advisory Commissions
REPORTS							
1) Harvey Bundy Report for the Hoover Commission 1949	No new agencies				HEW and new one		
2) Hoskins Report Oct. 29, 1954					HEW as clearing house	5 yr. approp's.	
8) Office of Ed.- Staff Paper 1960					HEW (Office Ed.)		
9) Morrill Report December 1960	Private Organiz.	Build up Asst. Secy. St.			I.C.A. Off. Ed. D/ Defense		
10) Report of Task Force for JFK Jan. 5, 1961	Adv. Comm. on Ed. Ex.	Under Secy. State		Expand progs. through		Use of foreign curren-cies	
11) Rep. to Pres. Eisenhower Feb. 6, 1961	Quasi-Ind. Fdn.						
12) W.H. Laves Report, 1961		Under Secy. State		Admin., planning, financing		"no-year" & foreign curren-cies	New Comm.

13) Humphrey Amendment August 1961					HEW (Office Ed.)		
17) House Report 1352 April 27, 1964	Coord. Agency						
18) Philip Coombs Report, 1964	Agency within D/State	Under Secy. St.	Director Resp. to Ambass.			New Approp.	
19) John Gardner AID & Univs. April 1964	Semi-Auton. gov. Inst. NIETC			AID with others		Long-term	
20) EWA Rep. on Off. Ed. Sept. 1964		Office Intn'l. Coop.		Office Ed. as link	Office Ed.		
23) "Ways to Improve U.S. Forein Ed. Aid" P. Coombs 1965	Quasi-indep. body for Ed. Resp.			Espec. w. foreign bilateral programs			to advise bureaucracy
24) White House Conf. Report, 1965	Semi-auton. fdn. bet. gov./private	Under Secy of State		Internat'l Secretariat	Prestige of Pres. of U.S.		
26) Neglected Aspects of Foreign Affairs C. Frankel 1965	Semi-auton. fdn; career indiv's	Under Secy State	Fdn. staff to serve in embassies				

27) Message from from Pres. Johnson Feb. 2, 1966	Council on Intn'l Ed.	Center for Ed. Coop. in HEW	Ed. officers resp. to Ambass.			Use of foreign currencies	
30) U.S. Advisory Commission Report Feb. 1968	Public/ private entity						

1. Bundy, Harvey H. and James Grafton Rogers. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS. 1949.

Recommendation 1:

New agencies of the Federal Government should not be created to conduct foreign affairs.

Recommendation 8:

The State Department should consult and advise with other departments and agencies for the purpose of assisting them to administer their respective instruments of foreign policy in a consistent mannner and to achieve approved policy objectives.

There is a tendency for the Department of State to duplicate staffs of other agencies to do functions which are more appropriate to other departments. Instead, the President should insist that each agency discharge its responsibilities in a competent manner, and then create better machinery for coordination between the State Department and the other agencies.

Recommendation 9:

The State Department as a general rule should not have responsibility for operation of programs such as foreign assistance or propaganda programs except where the considerations for imposition of such responsibility are overwhelming.

These propaganda operational responsibilities such as presently authorized under the United States Foreign Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, could be transferred to a government corporation or presidential agency and the educational exchange duties to the Federal Security Agency (now HEW). In the former case, for the time being at least, close policy guidance by the State Department would continue to be necessary. In the latter, the Federal Security Agency would appear to require certain reorientation and reorganization in order to discharge these additional duties.

Recommendation 22:

Few departments and agencies have recast their organizations to meet effectively their increased responsibilities in foreign affairs. Some of the bureaus or offices within the major executive establishments have had to operate largely without benefit of topside direction. This situation has placed an added administrative burden upon the State Department as it often has had to try to coordinate constituent parts of a department, or to sit silently in interdepartmental committees, while contending bureaus of one agency resolve their internal differences....

Important tasks for such a department or agency coordinating officer to perform would include supervision and improvement in its committee participation; assurance of the development of a departmental or agency viewpoint before its representative speaks in an interdepartmental conference; follow-up on departmental or agency committee and international conference commitments; functioning as the department's or agency's focal point for liaison on foreign affairs matters; fostering of required cooperation and working relationships; review of departmental or agency legislative proposals to determine impact on foreign affairs; overcoming of insular or domestic perspective of departmental or agency personnel performing substantive work involving foreign and domestic considerations; avoidance of departmental or agency attempts to separate domestic and foreign aspects of work; and coordination of all departmental and agency report requests to overseas missions.

2. REPORT ON AMERICAN OVERSEAS EDUCATION. October 29, 1954.

CONCLUSIONS (A through J)

A. Overseas Education Programs are Widespread and Uncoordinated.

Overseas education programs are conducted by more than a thousand different public and private, U.S. and international agencies whose activities stretch to all parts of the world. The full nature and extent of these operations cannot be fully determined at this time. Information about the work of some agencies is not readily obtainable. Programs are known to vary in size from the sponsorship of one student from abroad for study in the United States to the U.S. program for technical cooperation for which funds in the amount of $112 million were requested for fiscal year 1955. The work of some of the kinds of agencies reviewed in this study leads to the conclusion that many are pursuing their own self-interest in education programs without benefit of knowledge of the plans and operations of most of the others. There are estimated to be at least 300 private organizations and 30 government agencies engaged in exchange programs alone. It is likely that there are some duplications of effort and gaps in programs which detract from maximum effectiveness of total operation. The aggregate effort would profit from a free interchange of information about plans and programs.

There is some small amount of interlocking interest and cooperation in program operations among both public and private agencies. This is commendable and should be encouraged by the establishment of an acceptable mechanism for coordination of knowledge and experience applicable to the solution of technical problems as well as guidance to agency effort in the interest of avoiding gaps and duplication in the coverage of the field.

F. The Technical Competence of the Permanent Departments of Government is not being Employed to the Extent it is Available.

The permanent departments of government have long had executive responsibilities which have required participation by them in program operations overseas. Some have had education programs under their own legislative authority which antedates the Act for International Development, and some agencies have had at least a few experts who were as well known abroad as they are at home. Under the Technical Cooperation Administration program of the Department of State, the permanent agencies had "technical backstopping" responsibilities which included recruitment and employment of personnel as well as program planning and operating functions which called into play the technical competence of those agencies. As administered by the Foreign Operations Administration, except for conducting training programs for foreign participants, the program now makes use of the so-called technical agencies for little more than the nomination of properly qualified personnel for employment as desired by the operating agency. Cognizance is taken of the virtue of foreign operation program centralization, but it is concluded that the technical competence of the permanent agencies of government is not now being utilized to the maximum benefit of the government in pursuit of foreign policy objectives.

Concern has been expressed by officials of the permanent departments of government at the inability of these agencies to offer satisfactory service in overseas education programs, and they refer to the danger in not utilizing the resources of the departments, particularly their advice and guidance in the creation of programs and projects in terms of overall government policy. They suggested that centralization of administration of overseas programs necessitates duplication of technical staff in government.

G. The International Governmental Education Programs are Making a Contribution to the Increase of Social and Economic Levels in the Underdeveloped Countries.

The international governmental programs are sometimes more acceptable to foreign governments than the U.S. bilateral education programs. ...The United Nations programs enjoy an advantage in recruitment of personnel over US, programs in that they have a large number of countries in which to seek qualified personnel, and in some areas of professional specialization other countries have had more experience than ours in research and the development of programs to solve pressing problems.

The effort to avoid operating conflicts and duplications in the work of bilateral and multilateral programs is meeting with some success. However, room for improvement exists in total planning and coordination in the field for the accomplishment of U.S. and foreign country objectives. The education programs of the smaller, regional international governmental organizations appear to be serving a worthwhile need in their programs, projects and conferences aimed at improving social and economic levels of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries....

H. Education is But One of the Techniques Available for the Implementation of U.S. Foreign Policy.

Programs of education overseas must join with others such as diplomatic representation, informational activities, and military assistance to form a common front in the attack upon Communist efforts to win over the people of the underdeveloped countries. Education is just one tool among several available to the United States to gain success in the objectives of our foreign policy. In any given country, education programs should be integrated with others to the end that coordinated effort may be assured in accordance with the aims of this government to present the case for democracy as against totalitarianism. There is an uncoordinated campaign in our present effort to advance the cause of U.S. foreign policy in other countries. The several government agency programs should be reviewed at a high level in the executive branch to assure a united front among government agencies against the opposition to the free world. Coordination by OCB would be one method to assure an integrated plan of foreign operations.

RECOMMENDATIONS (A through J)

A. Clearing House Service Should be Provided for Both Private and Public Agency Education Activities.

There is need for clearing house service for both private and public agencies where information about agency endeavor would be immediately available.

1. A competent private agency should be requested to make an inventory of private effort....

2. An agency of the government, preferably the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is experienced in the collection and dissemination of educational information, and which now has a small clearing house service for the Department of State and FOA programs for visitors to the U.S., should be assigned the clearing house responsibility. Cooperation should be required by agencies responsible for all programs financed by the U.S. Government, including international educational programs and other international programs that have educational components which are supported by funds appropriated by the U.S. Congress.

F. Steps Should be Taken to Enable Operating Agencies Better to Utilize the Technical Competence of the Permanent Departments of Government.

It is recommended that a study be conducted to determine the most acceptable agency relationships and organizational patterns within agencies which will permit the best interests of the government to be served. It is essential that there be a maximum utilization of the investment in existing U.S. technical knowledge and skills in the solution of overseas education problems. It is understood that a Hoover Commission Task Force on Overseas Economic Operations is now considering this situation. Hopefully, a method will be proposed preserving the desirable features of centralization and providing for the greatest utilization of the technical competence of the permanent agencies of government.

G. U.S. Government Support for Multilateral Programs Should Be Continued.

It is believed proper that U.S. participation in the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance be continued at approximately the present programmed levels and not to exceed 50 per cent of the tot contribution by the several governments, and that program planning and accomplishments would be improved if authorization for support of these agencies could be placed on a five-year basis. Similarly, the activities of the other International Governmental Educational organization should continue to receive U.S. support to an extent at least equal to FY 1955 program estimates....

It would appear that these agencies have much to contribute to each other from their experience in the solution of technical problems. Cooperation among them and with U.S. Government agencies operating similar programs should be stimulated. An analysis of area needs, problems faced in meeting these needs, operating methods and program accomplishments of the several international agencies, particularly the smaller regional agencies by U.S. technical experts is suggested as a device to commence activities leading toward cooperative action.

H. In Furtherance of U.S. Foreign Policy Aims Education Program Should be Considered in Relation to Other International Programs to Assure Integrated Effort Among All Agencies to Win the Uncommitted People of the Free World to Our Side.

It is recommended that education programs be coordinated with other U.S. Government foreign programs on a country-by-country basis by a review of operating proposals at the planning stage in the OCB or the NSC. This would lead to proper emphasis and direction of effort of all international programs in terms of U.S. and foreign country objectives so that all U.S. public agencies operating in those countries would strive for the achievement of common objectives....

3. FEDERAL ACTIVITY IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION. 1955.

The Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, was appointed in June 1954 to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the extent of Federal activity in the field of education.

Of the five recommendations submitted, one dealt with international education:

> "4. International educational programs should be under the operational supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

4. REPORT ON OVERSEAS ECONOMIC OPERATIONS. 1955.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was established in accordance with Public Law No. 83-108. An investigation into the field of mutual security was undertaken by a task force appointed by the Commission in response to the wish of certain congressional members of the Commission.

The Congress had determined by the Mutual Security Act of 1954 that the Foreign Operations Administration should be ended as an independent agency. President Eisenhower had proposed establishment of a semi-autonomous agency - the International Cooperation Agency - in the Department of State to carry out the functions of the Foreign Operations Administration.

The task force recommended that the Director of the International Cooperation Administration "would have in the main a coordinating and planning function and not in the main an operational function. This can be accomplished by having existing live agencies perform many of the operating activities subject to central planning and coordination." Two of the recommendations are quoted below:

Recommendation 1:

a. That the Secretary of State, through the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, maintain strong control of the function of developing policies, objectives, and programs for nonmilitary foreign aid with respect to each country for which such aid is authorized; and, wherever advantageous and economical to do so, make full use of the staffs and facilities of the various departments and agencies of government on a reimbursable basis to perform activities in connection with these programs. At the same time, the Secretary of State should establish an inspection service to insure complete adherence to the policies, objectives, and programs for each country as defined by him.

b. That the Director of the International Cooperation Administration should be responsible for the preparation of the budget and the accountability of all funds for nonmilitary foreign aid programs which should be appropriated to and expended by the Department of State, and should report to the Congress the expenditures made.

c. That the different agencies in many cases will be able to discharge their duties from their present staffs, but if they should require additional staff, they should be free to obtain it from any quarter.

d. That the overseas nonmilitary personnel of United States agencies be subject to the line authority and direction of the United States Chief of Diplomatic Mission in each country.

Recommendation 10:

That subject to recommendation No. 1, the conduct of all activities of the Foreign Operations Administration in the field of health and education be administered, to the greatest extent possible, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (this does not include the activities under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts).

5. Morrill, James L. A PROPOSAL FOR THE COORDINATION OF THE EXCHANGE OF PERSONS PROGRAMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE SERVICE AND OF THE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION. 1956.

CONCLUSIONS:

Two paramount conclusions emerge from the study which define the need for, and the general character of, my recommendations. These are:

1. Authoritative coordination of the two programs which have developed independently but which are rapidly merging in fact, is needed in all common sense. The "grey area", the area of overlap, duplication and competition urgently requires attention.

2. The time has clearly come for an upgrading of U.S. exchange activity in governmental, Congressional, American public and foreign consciousness. There is not only the plainly necessitous task of coordination to be undertaken, but also the function of leadership and governmental spokesmanship in elevating cultural and technical exchange to the level of a major instrument of American influence and assistance in international affairs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Department of State appoint a Coordinator for Cultural and Technical Exchange working, of course, in cooperation and agreement with the International Cooperation Administration.

The Coordinator should occupy a new position with the title and rank of Assistant Secretary of State.

Alternatively, however, the Coordinator might be appointed as a Special Assistant to the Secretary, or the Under Secretary, with the rank but not the title of Assistant Secretary--if this seems more feasible and preferable to the Department.

The establishment of such a position and the appointment to it of an outstanding person seems to me to be the only practicable solution to the present unsound and unsatisfactory situation. In the course of this study, I have reviewed, I believe, all possible alternatives for solving the problem.

Under this proposal the Coordinator would have clearly defined responsibilities by authority of the Secretary of State. His role would be that of coordination (unless the Department of State should determine to give him line authority over IES). It is not recommended that he have line operational authority over ICA exchange activities. But his functions would include the following:

1. Providing, in behalf of the Secretary, an authoritative administrative focus for joint ICA-IES policy and planning, country by country, for exchange activities.
2. Coordinating the budgetary requirements of the two programs in such a way as to ensure that the total exchange program and its implications are clearly understood by the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress.
3. Assuring conformity with agreed joint policy and planning by the operational staffs of ICA and IES.
4. Stimulating increased exchange activities by private agencies and taking account of these in the lessened or augmented planning of governmental exchange.
5. Developing explicit assignment of responsibility to IES and ICA of categories of outgoing and incoming exchange personnel so that the work of the two agencies will not overlap but will complement and supplement each other in a well planned pattern of cooperation.
6. Organizing the cooperation of ICA and IES staffs in the joint placement, orientation and scheduling of certain categories of outgoing and especially incoming exchange personnel in both programs at educational institutions, governmental and other agencies, private institutions and the like.
7. Taking special cognizance of the ICA "college contract" enterprise in order to coordinate the relevant IES cultural exchang resources with the technical activities of ICA a carried out under this college contract program

8. Developing in cooperation with ICA and IES a pattern and procedure in countries where both ICA and IES operate exchange programs whereby coordination can be effected vis-a-vis Washington including procedures for a more effective follow up on the activities of foreign nationals who have been in the United States under the auspices of one or the other of the programs.

It seems evident that the success of the recommended planned pattern of cooperation between the two programs will depend in part on an increase in the funds presently available for the IES program. This could be accomplished either through an increase in the IES appropriation or through some budgetary transfer arrangement effected between IES and ICA.

6. GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION (A SURVEY AND HANDBOOK). 1959.

This report was prepared by the International Operations Subcommittee in order to fill the need for an ordered body of information on the number and types of government programs currently in operation. The hope was to thereby create a basis for evaluation of government activities in the field of international education.

The core of evaluation presented here is this: "It seems clear that there is not only the lack of overall policy and the lack of an overall coordinating agency but even a lack of comprehensive, organized information on what all the agencies of the Government have been doing in this field."

7. Cater, Douglass C. WORLD PROGRESS THROUGH EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE: THE STORY OF A CONFERENCE. 1959

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Partnership between government and private groups is essential. Both must be prepared to contribute increased effort and finances.

2. Government's role needs continual examination to make certain it is being effectively administered.

At the conference, Senator Mundt proposed a Department of International Public Relations to be charge with all government cultural and educational exchanges, as well as the information programs.

8. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION. 1960.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be directly represented at the highest level of policy formulation and program planning for any aspect of foreign policy in which education is an objective of the major means to achieve an objective.
2. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Education should have primary and direct operating responsibility for Federal international programs that are basically educational in substance and in purpose, and for those portions of other international programs that affect directly the cause of education and call for primarily educational competence.
3. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Office of Education) should have explicit responsibility for serving the government as a source of information on all Federal international education activities and as an advisory unit to all other Federal agencies whose international activities involve the use of American educational facilities and staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. There should be established an interdepartmental committee on international education policy to advise the Secretary of State on the use of education as an instrument of foreign policy.
2. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Education should be designated by stature to have primary and direct operating responsibility for Federal international programs that are basically educational in substance and purpose and for those portions of other international programs that affect directly the cause of education and call for primarily educational competence.
3. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Office of Education) should be given explicit responsibility for serving the government as a source of information on all international education activities and as an advisory unit to all other Federal agencies whose international activities involve the use of American educational facilities and staff.

9. THE UNIVERSITY AND WORLD AFFAIRS. 1960.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Universities and Colleges

1. All American institutions of higher learning should make studies of world affairs an important and permanent dimension of their undergraduate programs.

2. All American universities should improve the competence of their graduate and professional schools to teach and to conduct research on international aspects of their disciplines and professions.

3. Many universities (more than at present) should become diversified centers of strength to train specialists in world affairs for careers in teaching and other professions, government and business; to undertake research; to exercise leadership in language-training and linguistics; to prepare teaching materials for all levels of education; and to open the perspectives of scholarship to other institutions and to adult citizens in their communities.

4. Most universities and colleges have students and scholars from other countries. These institutions need to develop special educational programs fitting the needs of their foreign guests.

5. Many universities and colleges would benefit from undertaking cooperative activities with educational institutions in other countries. A few should undertake programs of assistance to educational institutions overseas.

6. Universities that undertake a wide range of programs in world affairs, at home and abroad, face complex problems of management. Their faculties and administration alike need to develop long range priorities and plans in order to make the most effective use of their scarce resources and make possible the balanced, yet flexible, growth of the total university educational program.

The Federal Government

7. The Congress and the Executive should support, on a continuing and flexible basis, university and college programs to improve the education of Americans in world affairs. The National Defense Education Act provides a modest precedent for the kind of support that is needed. Support should not

be limited to foreign language and area studies, but should be extended to other studies where greater American competence is needed in the national interest. Support should be related to university activities overseas so that domestic and foreign programs are mutually strengthened.

8. The Congress and the Executive should give much more emphasis to education in programs of foreign assistance. Requests to American universities for participation in overseas activities should be limited to educational tasks for which the universities are specially suited.

9. The Congress and the Executive in authorizing and administering programs that bring foreign nationals to our universities and colleges or enable American teachers and students to go abroad should seek to strengthen the participating educational institutions.

10. Government programs for educational cooperation and assistance abroad will be more effective when the government: provides funds on a long-term basis to support the varied university activities of training and research that will enable universities to operate effectively overseas as educational institutions; enables cooperating universities to participate at an early stage of planning programs they are asked to carry out; respects university autonomy to the fullest extent compatible with responsibilities of government for overall development programs overseas.

State Governments

11. State Legislatures and Executives should recognize that world affairs are of direct economic and political importance to the people of their states, and that programs in world affairs are in integral part of any university or college and are correspondingly eligible for and deserving of support from state funds.

Foundations

12. Private foundations should assist the universities and colleges to achieve more adequate programs in world affairs.

Private Enterprise

13. Like American education, American private business enterprise has a great and growing stake in international matters.

Organizing for Educational Leadership

14. Improved educational leadership and machinery for cooperation is needed both within the government and outside the government among the many American institutions concerned with the role of the university in world affairs.

15. A new private organization should be created to strengthen the educational leadership of American universities and colleges in world affairs.

16. In the federal government, the up-grading of educational competence at all levels is indispensable and overdue. In order to manage properly the enlarged role of the government in this field, the attention of the government agencies concerned needs to be focused on more effective use of university resources in program planning and implementation, and on the provision of government support to help build university competence in world affairs. The following additional steps are urged for consideration in plans for government organization and legislation:

    a. In the Department of State, enhancement of the authority and functions of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations.

    b. Upgrading the authority and competence of the Office of Education in the field of support to American higher education for world affairs activities.

    c. Designation by the president of the field of higher education and world affairs as an area of special concern for one of his assistants and as an area requiring special arrangements for coordination among the Cabinet officers concerned -- such as the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the head of the International Cooperation Administration or any successor agency.

The following recommendations pertain to the major Federal agencies concerned with universities and world affairs.

International Cooperation Administration

ICA should move more rapidly toward increased emphasis on educational development. The university contract is an effective instrument to marshal the resources of the universities for programs of educational assistance. This contract relationship, however, can be improved to provide the autonomy and flexibility appropriate to the university's participation with government in a cooperative undertaking. Universities should be brought in at an earlier stage of planning. Greater care should be exercised in choosing overseas projects appropriate for university contracts and in finding the appropriate university for a particular overseas contract or participant training assignment. The contract or the participant training agreement should serve also to build the university's own resources by improving its competence in teaching and research. Universities selected need to have an assurance of continuity in the ICA program itself which is essential to permit the university to make necessary long-term commitments for staff and facilities and which cannot be derived solely from lengthening particular contracts. Lastly, financial and accounting provisions in the contract arrangements should be further simplified.

Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (Department of State)

The educational exchange programs of the Department of State are peculiarly appropriate instruments for the mutual enrichment of American and overseas universities. In order to be fully effective, however, the selection and placement processes should put more emphasis on strengthening the educational institutions of the overseas society and the participating American universities. Additional funds are required for this purpose.

U. S. Office of Education

The provisions of Title VI of the National Defense Education Act for the support of language and area studies in American universities are now the principal source of language and area studies in American universities are now the principal source of federal funds to build centers of strength for these activities in the universities. The scope of the NDEA should be greatly expanded to provide further support for the world affairs activities of universities, including institutional grants to develop needed resources.

Department of Defense (Military Assistance Program)

The use of universities in the Military Assistance Program should be expanded beyond its present very narrow limits, along the lines recommended in the Draper Report, to provide broad-gauge instruction in political science, public administration and related subjects, for limited numbers of senior officers of friendly foreign military forces; to help train instructors and organize training centers to prepare foreign military forces for work on economic development projects; and to give university-level instruction to U.S. officers about to be assigned to Military Assistance Advisory Groups or to other positions requiring special world affairs background. In this expansion, however, the universities should be careful not to accept short-term assignments inconsistent with their basic functions.

10. REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON "EXCHANGE OF PERSONS." 1961.

EXCERPTS

"Action Center'

This kind of effective action by Government is achieved through the establishment of an action center, that is, a post which is given sufficient backing by the President and his Cabinet to activate, stimulate, and coordinate varied programs in different governmental departments and agencies. By virtue of the signal importance given this position in the achievement of far-reaching national objectives, it should be possible to find a person of real stature--imaginative, thoughtful and capable--to take such a position.

Under Secretary of State

This strong position could be established in the Department of State, as an Under Secretary (or Deputy Under Secretary) of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, or it could be set up in the Executive Office of the President, as an Executive Assistant for International Educational and Cultural Affairs. For many reasons, including our awareness of the great interest of the incoming Secretary of State in this area, we favor placing it in the Department of State, in line with the first alternative offered above.

Separate Coordination from Operation

If established as an Under Secretary (or Deputy Under Secretary) of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, we caution against perpetuation of the present arrangement in which the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State and the officer who is expected to coordinate all government programs operating through many different departments and agencies (e.g., State, ICA, USIA, HEW, Agriculture, etc.). It is our observation that this officer could not coordinate other departments while heading the operations of one department, and that he had insufficient power to coordinate. He was unable to coordinate effectively programs outside his own department unless the agency operating them chose to be coordinated.

Commission

In order to give strength to the coordinated educational, technical and cultural exchange program of the United States, we recommend the creation of a new Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. The new commission would advise the new Under Secretary.

This presidentially appointed citizen body can most easily be established through legislation to amend Public Law No. 402 which created the existing U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange.

a. The amendment should broaden the scope of the Commission to include the full spectrum of educational exchange and development, with special reference to the establishment of mutually fruitful relations with the private agencies;

b. The amendment should give authority for the Commission to assemble ad hoc consultant panels for short-term consideration of particular problems, with a member of the Commission serving as chairman of each of the panels so convened (and, in appropriations legislation, provide funds for the operation of these consultant panels);

c. The amendment should expand the membership from five to nine in order to get a more representative group of persons who have knowledge of and experience in the varied operations of exchange and development programs in the United States and abroad; the requirement that they have particularly political party affiliations should be eliminated; and

d. The amendment should authorize an adequate staff for the Commission.

If presidential leadership is provided, and a strong action position is established and well-filled, then one could deal with the specific operational proposals which are seen as being important to the success of the program.

Use Foreign Currency

We recommend that the President request of the Bureau of the Budget immediate action toward utilizing for international educational and cultural purposes more foreign currency accumulated from agricultural sales and loans. These holdings constitute a capital asset of the American people through which should be created a Mutual Educational and Cultural Cooperation Fund (a "Kennedy plan" similar in impact to the Marshall Plan).

Educational Development

Combined with increased dollar appropriations, the foreign currency holdings would provide ample funds for local expenditures in many of the principal areas of the world where educational and cultural development programs are most in need of expansion. The funds could be used to assist financing, not only of U.S. Government programs but of U.S. university and other private educational programs abroad (university-to-university programs, graduate area-study centers abroad, student and "youth corps" activities, etc., etc.).

Program Requests: Foreign Currencies

Therefore, we recommend that departments and agencies of Government conducting educational, cultural, and technical and cooperation programs (State, ICA, USIA, Agriculture, HEW, etc.) be requested immediately to submit to the Department of State program proposals to be financed from these foreign currencies, making maximum cooperative use of private agencies to provide program services.

Supplemental Dollar Requests

These foreign currencies are not available in some parts of the world most in need of assistance, such as Africa, for example, and accompanying dollar expenditures are necessary to support their most effective use. Thus, we recommend that departments and agencies of Government conducting educational, cultural, and technical cooperation programs (as noted above) be requested immediately to submit supplemental dollar proposals for fiscal year 1962 for programs urgently needed and now excluded from the budget request to be submitted by President Eisenhower.

Strengthen Private Sector

Educational institutions, foundations and other private agencies now carry the largest part of the total American program or educationa and cultural cooperation. Their direct services to students and visit are the "cutting edge" of the program. They are increasingly pressed expand their services to American students and others. There is a desperate need for more dollars to strengthen these institutions so that they may improve and expand their indispensible contributions.

Alternative Ways to Aid

New Appropriations must be authorized. They could be administere either by the Department of State, and by other governmental agencies, or through a new government-aided foundation especially established for this purpose.

Therefore, legislation was recommended in regard to:

Foreign Students

a. authorize matching grants to universities and colleges, for counseling, orientation to American life, English language training, and other assistance to foreign students, 90 percent of whom are not sponsored nor financed by the U.S. Government

b. authorize matching grants to local organizations for direct expenses incurred in programing sizable numbers of U.S. Government-sponsored, short-term foreign visiting leaders and specialists

Real Costs of Education

c. reimburse the educational institutions (on the pattern of the original G. I. bill) for the real costs of educating U.S. Government-sponsored foreign students and ICA participants, to the extent that these costs exceed normal tuition fees

Emergency Aid

d. provide funds to universities, colleges, and other selected organizations for emergency assistance to superior non-Government sponsored foreign students to help them reach a nearly attained academic objective (along the lines of the precedent established through the former Chinese student emergency aid program from 1950 to 1954); and

Foreign Scholars

f. provide funds to universities to enable them to bring foreign visiting scholars and graduate students for teaching, research and study; (e.g., either in order to bring strategic individuals who might not accept a direct U.S. Government grant, or to help them replace a faculty member released for service in a less developed country with one from a more highly developed country).

Action Needed

Action needed to implement this recommendation is legislation, either directing the Secretary of State or creating a new Government-aided foundation especially established, to administer--

a. matching grants to universities for special services to foreign students;

b. matching grants to local organizations for special expenses for programing Government-sponsored short-term visitors;

c. funds to reimburse universities for the real costs of educating Government-sponsored foreign students and ICA participants;

d. grants to universities and other selected organizations for emergency assistance to superior foreign students; and

e. grants to enable universities to bring selected foreign scholars.

Technical Irritants

Agencies of Government need to take seriously the minor technical irritants which inhibit the most effective operation of exchange programs and move vigorously to remedy them. We recommend that the Secretary of State undertake the revision of regulations and the proposal of new legislation, where necessary, to--

Immigration Law

a. revise visa provisions in order to place the spouse and minor children of a foreign scholar on the same visa as he, and to extend the employment privileges of foreign scholars;

Social Security

b. change social security withholding tax provisions to exempt foreign scholars who never can achieve social security benefits; and

Visitor Per Diem

c. increase and make uniform per diem stipends for living expenses for short-term foreign visitors sponsored by different Government agencies.

Viewpoints

The preparation of the report has led us to a number of viewpoints which we wish to state. These recommendations do not embody the immediacy and urgency criteria which we have tried to apply to the foregoing.

Youth Corps

a. In view of the large resources in many parts of the American citizenry--younger people, minority groups, educators, and others--from which persons could be selected for service in less-developed countries, we urge careful attention to the selection, orientation and, particularly, the supervision and use of such people to the end that their service clearly benefit the peoples toward whom it is extended.

Youth Corps

b. The very fruitful Fulbright programs have been developed through binational agreements based upon the chance availability of foreign currencies. We consider this an inadequate basis for directing our national efforts for educational exchange and recommend the development of means to extend these binational programs using better criteria.

More U.S. Institutions

c. We recommend that agencies of Government encourage participation of all qualified U.S. institutions of higher education in cultural cooperation programs.

Development Needs

d. In exchange with the less-developed countries, give priority to the selection of people whom these countries need for the development of indigenous institutions consonant with their national development goals.

U.S. Agencies

e. Explore possibilities for the effective expansion of educational exchange and technical assistance programs through intergovernmental agencies: UN, OAS, etc.

Research

f. Research on the method of educational, technical, and cultural exchanges should be supported by the agencies operating educational and cultural exchange programs.

11. EXTRACTS FROM THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION ACTIVITIES ABROAD. 1961.

Foreign Educational Development

Through various programs and agencies, the U.S. Government is already providing considerable help to education and training abroad, particularly to persons in the less developed countries. These programs, though valuable, are diffuse and frequently not readily identifiable with the United States. They are subordinate elements of agencies and activities directed principally to other things. They have no single voice or general leadership. They are not based on a coherent and avowed overall policy or legislative enactment. They therefore fail in large part to realize their great symbolic value in identifying the United States clearly with one of the universal human ideals -- education.

The Committee feels there is need to move with conviction in giving new accent to our assistance to foreign education. This should be made concrete in the form of a new declaration of policy in support of long-term assistance to foreign educational development by the President and the Congress.

The proposed program might include the continuation or initiation of such projects as the following:

1. Assistance in building and equipping model schools, laboratories and libraries as visible symbols of American help;
2. The creation of new regional institutions and training centers in public administration, agricultural technology and the management of enterprises;
3. The development of large mobile training centers to provide basic skills in health, agriculture, and mechanical trades to thousands of trainees at a time;
4. The mounting of experiments in the use of television to spread literacy and teach basic skills on a large scale;
5. The contribution of funds for "opportunity scholarships" to enable talented young people from all social classes in some of the less developed countries on the basis of open competition to acquire an education in their own country;
6. A major program for the training of teachers from the less developed countries and the establishment of teacher training institutes in those countries;
7. A program of training and orientation for young Americans who would spend a period abroad performing basic tasks such as teaching in elementary schools, working in the civil service, and acting as staff assistants in village development programs.

To carry out such a program one possible approach would be the creation of a new quasi-independent foundation for international educational development. Such a body could give the program visibility and leadership and help to link together government, university, and private foundation efforts.

An adequate program of assistance to foreign educational development will require substantial funds over and above those currently available for such purposes.

Exchange of Persons Programs

The U.S. Government is extensively engaged in exchange of persons programs and the training of foreign specialists and leaders in this country. These activities lack a clear framework of overall policy and require better arrangements for the handling of exchanges once they arrive here.

The Committee recommends that official exchange of persons programs be progressively expanded (except for Western Europe); and that priority be assigned to exchanges of students, specialists and leaders from Africa.

To make possible more effective handling of exchanges, funds will be required:

1. To expand and strengthen our specialized agencies which administer foreign student and leader exchanges;
2. To create an adequate nation-wide system, based on the voluntary help of local citizens and groups, for hospitality to foreign visitors;
3. To provide special guidance and courses tailored to meet the needs (often very different from those of the American student) of students from the less developed countries.

Intra-Agency Organization

The Committee recommends that the President reaffirm to all departments and agencies the importance of adequately considering foreign opinion factors in the formulation of policies and the execution of programs which have impact abroad; that he request the Departments of State and Defense to continue and reinforce the efforts already made to this end; and that he ask the heads of other departments and agencies to take whatever organizational or procedural steps may be necessary in this connection, leaving to their discretion the determination of the particular methods to be used.

The coordination of information activities in the general structure of the U.S. Government is a formidable problem. They are conducted by a number of different departments and agencies, and they are both diverse in character and substantial in scale. Even more complex is the task of integrating psychological factors in substantive programs affecting opinion abroad.

In the areas of foreign educational development, exchange of persons, English language teaching, exhibits and trade fairs, and radio and television, there is need for increased integration and coordination of current efforts.

12. Laves, Walter H. C. TOWARD A NATIONA[illegible]T IN INTERNATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS. 1961.

PURPOSE

The study is concerned primarily with the purposes and basic policies of the various educational exchange programs administered by the Department of State, and seeks to appraise these purposes and policies in the light of U.S. involvement with the rest of the world. The relationships of these programs to the other international programs of the U.S. Government and to comparable activities under private auspices and the content of the programs is subject to review.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Presidential Action

1. It is recommended that the President personally and vigorously identify to the American people and to Congress the crucial importance of international educational and cultural programs and that he give continuous support to such programs in the conduct of U.S. foreign relations.

2. It is recommended that the President establish an organizational structure within the executive branch which will assure consistent and purposeful national action in international educational and cultural affairs.

a. Various educational and cultural affairs programs should be consolidated in an agency (CU, USIA, or AID)

b. A clearer concept of the role of HEW is needed.

c. Similar lines of responsibility as those developed in Washington should be established within U.S. missions abroad.

3. The authority of the Secretary of State for policy direction in the full range of educational and cultural affairs (including education, science, culture, information, and the educational aspects of technical assistance) should be clearly affirmed and supported by the President.

4. An Under Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs should be designated to direct the development of policies and of programs consistent with them, and to advise on the allocation of funds to the component parts of the total program.

5. The President should direct the U.S. Office of Education to prepare programs designed to broaden the international orientation of curricula at all levels of American education. One means of doing this should be a greatly enlarged and broadened National Defense Education Act program.

a. The need to strengthen American curricula is broader than foreign languages, sciences, and area studies.

b. The scope of the Fulbright program should be expanded to more directly serve the needs of American colleges and universities.

c. Foreign guests should be programmed so that more Americans come in contact with them.

d. Exchange of teachers programs should be substantially increased.

6. Because the annual appropriation process makes long-term commitments difficult, and discourages long-term careful planning, the following policies should be adopted:

a. Appropriations should be made on a "no-year" basis.

b. The President should be authorized to transfer funds among agencies.

c. Annual appropriations should be made in dollars, leaving to the President the utilization of foreign currencies within the limits of dollar totals.

d. The President should direct the preparation of a plan for utilizing foreign currency accumulations from the sale of agricultural surpluses for establishing one or more mutual educational development funds. These funds could then be administered by a binational board.

B. Congressional Action

1. Specific action should be taken in regard to the multitude of advisory commissions which have been created over the years.

a. A careful analysis should be made of the purposes to be served by public advisory commissions.

b. The many advisory commissions and committees on educational and cultural affairs should be reviewed with a view to consolidation or clearer definition of functions in keeping with the organization developed for educational and cultural affairs.

c. The Congress should codify the legislation relative to international educational and cultural affairs, including information and the educational aspect of technical assistance.

d. A new commission should be established - the Advisory Commission on Educational and Cultural Affairs. It could then have subcommittees for specific subjects and geographic areas. It could be served by a single secretariat under the Under Secretary of State.

2. The Congress should give full legislative support to a coherent, long-range, government-wide program of international educational and cultural cooperation developed by the executive branch.

3. The Congress should repeal any legislation which prevents the executive branch from carrying on a positive information program for the American people about the nature and importance of international educational and cultural cooperation.

C. Policy and Planning Guidance by the Secretary of State

1. It is recommended that the Secretary of State provide firm policy guidance for international educational and cultural programs in the following respects:

a. Recognition that this relatively new aspect of U.S. foreign relations has become one of urgent and critical importance.

b. Recognition that U.S. international programs of education, science, culture, information, and technical assistance are so closely interrelated that they must have integrated policy guidance.

c. Recognition that, to an ever increasing extent, those educational, scientific, and cultural programs must be planned and, to a considerable extent, administered in close cooperation with other countries, the United Nations, and other international organizations.

d. Recognition that private and governmental activities in this field are complementary, and that it is a function of government to increase the interest, responsibility, and participation of non-governmental agencies.

2. The Secretary of State should establish appropriate mechanisms for country and regional planning among all agencies responsible for international programs in education, science, culture, information, and the educational aspects of technical assistance.

3. The Secretary of State should develop an adequate program of research regarding the relation of educational and cultural affairs to the conduct of foreign relations.

D. Program Recommendations

1. The government should limit its programs to those for which it can assure high quality of content and of administration.

2. All the major types of programs now carried on should be continued.

3. Much greater efforts should be made to interrelate in planning and administration the various arts of the educational and cultural efforts of the U.S. Government: education, science, culture, information, and the educational component of assistance to newly developing countries.

4. Virtually all programs should be increased in magnitude and should be more adequately financed.

5. Much greater emphasis should be placed on:

a. Programs designed to improve the education of the American people for their role in world affairs. These programs include the exchange of teachers and foreign visitors, the Peace Corps, and the Fulbright programs.

b. Programs designed to strengthen democratic institutions abroad. This entails joint planning and administration with other countries. Department of Defense programs should emphasize the relationship of the military to civilian life in democratic societies, and American military personnel overseas should be oriented in this same direction. Attempts should be made to relate voluntary organizations in the U.S. to corresponding groups abroad, especially in developing countries. U.S. Government officials serving abroad should have an understanding of the pluralistic and democratic character of American society.

c. Programs designed to assist new and emerging countries in their educational development. This required planning of massive programs based on priorities of educational development. Emphasis in the

Fulbright programs should be directed to the developing countries, and the U.S. should encourage a deeper involvement of American universities, foundations, and other private institutions.

6. Much greater emphasis should be placed on collaboration with other countries and with the U.N., UNESCO, OAS, and other international organizations in planning, administration, and financing of programs.

7. Continuing efforts should be made to relate the private and governmental sectors in a more unified national effort.

8. A deliberate program should be undertaken to inform the American people about the scope and importance of the U.S. international educational and cultural programs and the opportunities which these afford for individual contributions.

E. Recommendations concerning specific activities

1. Fulbright scholars.

a. A careful appraisal should be made of the actual need of government programs and funds in providing opportunities for academic exchanges between the U.S. and individual countries taking into account the availability of funds not only from sale of surpluses, but also from other sources in the U.S. and abroad. In making this appraisal means should be found for associating in it interested private persons and agencies of the U.S. as well as professional and governmental representatives from the countries concerned.

b. Dollar appropriations should be provided to carry out necessary governmental programs at a level that insures high quality of participants and the meeting of all appropriate related expenditures for grantees and for program administration. In particular, provision should be made for financing accompanying dependents of grantees.

2. Foreign students in the U.S.

a. Adequate funds should be appropriated to finance governmental grantees in a manner that assured maximum opportunity for a satisfactory educational experience in the U.S.

b. The Government should promote the establishment by American educational agencies of more effective means for careful selection of foreign students to enter American educational institutions.

c. The government should encourage educational institutions to provide all foreign students with special opportunities to learn about the culture and institutions of the U.S., and to assist foreign students to maintain their academic contacts after their return home.

3. Binational and international schools.

a. The U.S. should contribute substantially to the support and expansion of the binational and international schools. Funds are needed both in the form of capital grants and in the form of low-interest-rate loans. Funds are needed not only for the schools abroad, but for the servicing operations in the headquarters in Washington and New York.

b. Every effort should be made to assure access to the educational opportunities offered by these schools to qualified children of all races, creeds, and economic status and on a broader basis than is now the case.

c. Increased efforts should be made to develop a systematic relationship among these schools, permitting transfer of students and teachers, and to develop much closer professional relations between American educational institutions and the schools so that both students and teachers can be exchanged.

4. U.S. participation in UNESCO.

a. The policies of the U.S. toward UNESCO and its programs should be systematically examined in terms of their relation to general U.S. policy and of the other programs of the U.S. in international educational and cultural affairs, with a view to making them part of an integrated whole.

b. The role of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO should be appraised in its relation to the governmental and private effort in international educational and cultural affairs.

c. Greater emphasis should be placed upon U.S. cooperation with other governments through UNESCO in the full range of educational and cultural affairs.

5. Information or cultural centers.

a. Adequate funds should be provided for establishment of U.S. cultural or information centers in all countries or areas where there is a demonstrated need.

b. Efforts should be continued to achieve binational centers with joint management and joint support.

c. Where possible, the official designation should be "U.S. Information Center".

6. Availability of inexpensive American books.

a. There should be a continuing program of book translations, particularly of American classics, important out-of-print books and textbooks.

b. The special textbook publication program should be given dollar support.

13. Amendment to Section No. 621 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (PL 87-195), known as the Humphrey Amendment. 1961.

Section No. 621. Exercise of Functions

In such fields as education, health, housing or agriculture, the facilities and resources of other Federal agencies shall be utilized when such facilities are particularly or uniquely suitable for technical assistance, are not competitive with private enterprise, and can be made available without interfering unduly with domestic programs.

Senator H.H. Humphrey presented an additional statement to clarify the intent of his amendment:

> "First, the Congress should provide a mandate in S. 1983 for the United States Office of Education to make its maximum contribution abroad. ... Therefore, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should be represented at the highest level at which international education policy is formulated. In addition, the Office of Education should be given substantial responsibilities in operating those parts of international education programs which function inside the United States. The Office of Education should aid in the recruitment of personnel and should provide other advice and services to those programs which are operated by other branches of the Federal Government. And, finally, the professional resources of the Office of Education should be available to any other part of the government for the review of the effectiveness of any of their educational programs."

14. Coombs, Philip H. STRENGTHENING THE EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL COMPONENT OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY: A REPORT TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE. 1962.

"This report summarizes the activities of the newly created office of Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs from March, 1961 to May, 1962, the term of its first incumbent."

"The aim of the Administration in creating an Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs was to strengthen the role of these activities in United States foreign relations, to achieve greater unity and efficiency of Federal programs, and to stimulate greater cooperation between the Federal government and the private sector."

"The newly-created Office of Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs undertook four main tasks:

1. To give leadership and policy guidance, in behalf of the Secretary of State, to all federal agencies active in this field and to promote a more unified, efficient and effective total federal effort;

2. To stimulate increased private efforts, and to strengthen cooperation between the federal government and the academic community, voluntary organizations, foundations, professional societies and others;

3. To give policy and program direction and supervision to the Department of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs.

4. To formulate U.S. positions and exert U.S. leadership in this field through international organizations."

15. Haviland, H. Field, Jr. "Federal Programs of International Education." HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. 1963.

This study is mainly concerned with the relationship of government and the universities, and the ways universities can improve their collaboration with government to improve programs.

1. Priority attention should be given by universities to strengthening resources:

   a. Curriculum should be examined to insure that each course is pulling its appropriate weight in relation to the international objectives of the university.

   b. Faculty members should be encouraged to acquire relevant international backgrounds.

   c. An international component should be required as an integral part of every student's undergraduate program.

   d. Graduate schools should strengthen the international aspects of their offerings.

   e. Specialized international programs should strive for a reasonable balance between area and functional approaches.

   f. Foreign language training is an essential ingredient of any comprehensive international strategy.

   g. Increased opportunities for overseas training and research should be afforded both students and faculty.

   h. Universities should play a leading role in helping to improve international educational training at the primary and secondary levels and in adult programs.

2. Government contracts:

   a. The Government and the universities have an obligation to consider carefully whether a given institution has the basic motivation and capacity to do a particular job successfully. The availability of qualified personnel must also be considered.

   b. The interests of all concerned parties - government, university, host country - must be harmonized.

c. Government should reinforce the long-range nature of university participation through policy declaration, financial support, and administrative arrangements.

d. Government should provide support for supplementary activities, including general orientation of university personnel and intensive language preparation.

e. Government should loosen its financial and administrative regulations.

3. Direct government employment.

a. Universities can make a major contribution in helping to train, recruit, and maintain able staffs for U.S. Government.

b. Universities can assess the government's long-range personnel needs for developing operations, design education programs to help meet these requirements, support the improvement of government career opportunities, and encourage able people to choose these careers.

4. Foreign scholars in the U.S.

a. The government and the universities should cooperate in making certain that foreign students have the intellectual capacity, personal qualities, cultural conditioning, and the material support necessary to make their education experience successful.

b. Experience indicates that the greatest contribution can be made to graduate level students, rather than undergraduates.

c. A crucial aspect is counseling - selection, placement, orientation, and English language training.

d. Adequate financial support must be insured, including improved employment opportunities.

e. The follow-up process after the scholar has returned home must be reinforced - strengthen continuing contact; assist students to find appropriate career opportunities; evaluate these programs as a basis for improving them.

5. Export of U.S. scholars

a. Better long-range planning in close collaboration with related public and private agencies is necessary.

b. High standards of selection must be maintained.

c. Orientation, follow-up, and evaluation must be improved.

16. **BEACON OF HOPE.** Report of the United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. 1963.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The Foreign and American Grants

1. We recommend that the exchange program make a concerted effort to seek out and select more "have-nots" with particular promise and talent, so that in keeping with this country's traditions, an American exchange experience never becomes a privilege restricted to the elite.

2. We recommend that the exchange program make a particular effort to seek out and select those candidates abroad who are sufficiently vigorous and restless to help promote desirable social and economic change.

3. We recommend that more "field selection centers" be set up on a regional basis overseas, under private sponsorship, to assist U.S. universities and private agencies in choosing properly qualified students.

4. We recommend that a special study be made of private contract agencies to determine their present effectiveness and examine how they might more fully adapt themselves to the enormous growth in exchange in recent years. We recommend that all programs for all foreign visitors provide more time and arrangements for meeting a wide cross section of American families.

5. We recommend two remedies to increase the quality of American professors and lecturers selected for overseas grants:

   a. A substantial increase in the very low salaries now offered to professors and lecturers, even if this means sharply reducing the number of grantees, as well as an allowance for travel for the grantees' dependents;

   b. Increased use of direct recruitment of qualified candidates.

Policy and Administration

6. A special study should be made of the Cultural Affairs Officer, and the bearing that the administration of the educational and cultural program abroad by USIA may have on his work and career.

7. A special study should be made of the problems created for the exchange program and the limitations placed upon it by the heavy reliance on foreign currencies. Further, two financial problems demand immediate remedy:

a. Funds should be provided at once for dependents' travel in order to secure better caliber American professors and lecturers for overseas grants; and

b. The present ludicrously low official hospitality allowances available to the State Department should be increased.

8. Better coordination among the various government agencies involved in exchange or persons continues to be the highest priority objective for improvement of the program.

9. The character of the exchange program in any given country must be determined by the needs and character of that country, Thus, country-by-country planning is essential.

10. In the developing countries, the exchange program should, where possible and in keeping with the character of the program, directly concern itself with the strengthening of their educational and social institutions.

11. The new enthusiasm for work with developing nations should not lead to neglect or downgrading of the educational and cultural programs with Europe.

12. Coordination of the approach and procedures of the various government agencies vis-a-vis the universities is urgently needed on the problems of educational exchange and development. To relieve the financial pressure upon universities, the Commission endorses the proposal that "cost of education" grants be paid to them for all government-sponsored foreign students.

17. IDEOLOGICAL OPERATIONS AND FOREIGN POLICY. 1964.

FINDINGS

1. In the pursuit of its basic objectives in the world, the United States, unlike the Soviet Union, has assigned relatively low priority to the ideological and psychological area of foreign policy operations. The attention and the resources devoted to these operations do not begin to approach those expended on foreign military and economic activities.

2. There exists in the executive branch a broad range of nonmilitary and noneconomic programs which are directed at foreign audiences and can provide support for United States foreign policy. These, however, are yet to be orchestrated into an effective instrument of our foreign policy. The concept of an "ideological offensive" - of coordinating these programs and their application - thus far has been only partially implemented by the executive branch.

3. The coordination of programs operating in a particular field - for instance, information, research, exchanges of persons - is less than fully effective. While considerable progress has been made in recent years to improve coordination, there is evidence that greater effort will be required to complete the job and to eliminate duplication and underutilization of resources.

4. Perhaps the weakest aspect of the U.S. ideological effort in support of foreign policy is the apparent lack of a clearly defined, operational authority. Such direction is necessary, in our opinion, to coordinate programs operating on this plane and thereby maximize the effectiveness of our effort.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The need for organizing United States Government operations on the ideological and psychological plane and blending them into an effective effort in support of United States foreign policy, particularly with respect to the cold war challenge on this plane, should be acknowledged at the highest level in our government.

2. Operational authority for the management of ideological and psychological activities in support of United States foreign policy should be unified and placed at an appropriately high level in the executive branch.

3. A systematic evaluation of all government programs with a potential for influencing the attitudes of foreign audiences should be undertaken with a view to eliminating duplication, abandoning programs which are no longer related to the requirements of our foreign policy, and providing those which are, with a clearly defined mission.

4. The coordination of programs operating in each of the several fields--exchanges of persons, information, strategic psychological operations, and others--should be greatly improved. The implementation of recommendation No. 2 appears indispensable to the attainment of this objective. In addition, responsibility for coordination at lower

levels should be clearly defined and adequate authority provided to make possible effective discharge of such responsibility. The cumbersome structure of interdepartmental coordinating committees should be streamlined by reducing the number of such committees to the minimum required for effective operation.

5. To the extent possible, educational and informational activities should be brought into a single agency or department (as suggested by the United States Advisory Commission on Information). Existing division of operations and responsibility between the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and, to some extent, the Agency for International Development, is illogical and not conducive to efficiency and economy.

6. Government officials and personnel responsible for the conduct of ideological and psychological operations should be trained in the requirements and techniques of ideological warfare. It is not practical to try to bring all of these activities into a single government department or agency. It is both feasible and necessary, however, to provide appropriate training to the personnel of government departments involved in this type of foreign operations.

7. The input of the ideological and psychological dimension of foreign policy, particularly in the field of basic research in behavioral sciences, should be increased.

8. Cooperation with private enterprise should be strengthened. Prompt attention should be given to ways and means of achieving that goal.

18. Coombs, Philip H. THE FOURTH DIMENSION OF FOREIGN POLICY: EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS. 1964.

The following are arguments for the strengthening of the educational component of foreign policy, for in order to do their proper job in the future, educational policies must be shaped into a coherent whole by a clearer set of objectives, better planning, and more forceful and imaginative administration.

1. Proven record of accomplishments;
2. The great force of ideas, knowledge, and people in shaping world events;
3. The gravity of America's international problems, commitments, and obligations;
4. The evident impossibility of handling these problems solely by political, economic, and military means.

A. Improving the Organization

1. Create an Under Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.
   a. Charged with developing a unified set of policies to guide all international activities of the government in this field, and ensuring their proper coordination.
   b. Included under his purview would be all international scientific activities.

2. Create a semi-independent agency within the Department of State under the direction of the Under Secretary.
   a. The new agency would have much the same status that AID has now.
   b. It would amalgamate the activities of CU (which would disappear), USIA, and AID.
   c. It would seek separate appropriations under the Fulbright-Hays legislation.
   d. It would have latitude to develop a professional corps.
   e. It would establish overseas branches, perhaps designated as "U.S. Educational Foundations."
      (1) to consolidate exchange activities, libraries, educational development, etc.;
      (2) with a Director, who would replace CAO, and who would report directly to the U.S. Ambassador;
      (3) which would harmonize the related activities of all U.S. government agencies;
      (4) which would serve as the main points of contact and cooperation with private U.S. organizations functioning within the country.

B. Policies Toward Developing Countries

1. Attention should focus in the leaders and shapers of change.
   a. for example, on the exchange of youth leaders, young intellectuals, labor leaders, rising politicians, and government officials;

  - b. emphasis on English language instruction;
  - c. formulation of realistic and flexible visa policy;

2. Educational development should provide new nations with technical help to evolve educational plans.

  - a. It should reflect their own determination of needs and priorities.
  - b. It should assist through research, experimentation, and innovation.
  - c. Developing nations will have to train some of their educational personnel abroad.
    - (1) They will have to improve the selection process.
    - (2) They will have to better plan overseas training.
    - (3) They will have to ensure suitable employment when students return home.

3. Attention will have to be given to cultural development.

  - a. Assistance to evolution of cultural patterns, values, and institutions is a subtle and delicate affair.
  - b. Some of the potentially effective things that government can do is to help create libraries, theaters, museums, art galleries, etc.
  - c. Cultural development is often most effective when done through private channels.
  - d. Language development and literacy should be emphasized.

C. Bringing quality to the programs.

1. To improve the quality of American academic personnel and specialist sent abroad:

  - a. Stipends must be raised.
  - b. Travel allowances for wives must be provided.
  - c. Rigid scheduling rules must be relaxed.

2. To bring competent university personnel into the planning of projects at an early stage:

  - a. A small cadre of first rate "educational development strategists" to serve in the AID program must be recruited.

3. Recruit creative and well-versed personnel to serve as resident scholars, writers, or artists in an appropriate embassy for a year or two.

D. Strengthen Government-Private Cooperation

1. Three basic roles for government:
  - a. Helping to remove roadblocks to a free international trade in ideas and knowledge, and the encouragement of the private sector to engage vigorously in such trade;
  - b. Keeping the private sector well informed so that it can respond cooperatively and intelligently;

c. Taking of initiative by the Federal Government to do what is necessary when the success of foreign policy objectives calls for certain actions which the private sector cannot reasonably be expected to undertake on its own.

2. Five more specific guides for the government:

   a. Government agencies should harness energies and capacities of private agenices rather than try to do everything on their own.
   b. Private agencies should be brought into planning stages as early as possible.
   c. Government should recognize the unique functions and capabilities of private foundations, but they should not be asked to assume government's responsibilities.
   d. The government ought to avoid asking private organizations to do things which might compromise their integrity or jeopardize their future effectiveness.
   e. Government should speak up forthrightly when certain private activities in the international field are clearly jeopardizing, however unintentionally, the nation's best interests. Censorship, however, must be avoided.

19. Gardner, John W. AID AND THE UNIVERSITIES. 1964.

In July 1963, AID Administrator David E. Bell asked John W. Gardner, President of Carnegie Corporation and chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International and Cutltural Affairs, to form a task force to study the relations between the Agency for International Development and American universities.

The mission of the task force was to recommend steps leading to a strengthened partnership between the Agency and the universities in fulfilling the world responsibilities of both. Specifically, this meant finding ways to simplify contract procedures and to make cooperative action by AID and the universities more effective.

This report was submitted to Mr. Bell in March 1964.

A. The Role of the University

The role of the university is to work to strengthen institutions for human resource development, and to address itself to the achievement of long-term purposes:

1. educational growth and human resource development
2. advancement of knowledge
3. application of knowledge to basic problems

B. Participant Training by the Universities

1. The university should be more involved in early planning.

2. The selection process must consider the impact the student will make upon returning home.
3. A command of English should not be a major factor in the selection process. Intensive instruction should be made available.
4. Someone on the campus should be responsible for all the foreign students.

C. Research

1. Research must be supported vigorously.
2. AID should have in-house research staffs.
3. There is a need to increase development research.

D. Criteria for the Selection of Contractors

1. To what extent has the university developed its resources in the international field generally?
2. What is the caliber of the faculty in key fields?
3. Has the faculty shown any inclination toward the kind of interdisciplinary work so essential to development assistance?
4. What are the research resources of the university in fields relevant to development?
5. Has the university set itself up administratively to handle overseas projects?
6. Has the university had relevant earlier experience in overseas work?
7. What is the quality of personnel assigned to this specific project?
8. What is the degree of the university's commitment to the projects?

E. Requirements for an Effective Selection Process

1. State certain general considerations (see above) and make sure the people doing the selection are doing an intelligent job.
2. Selectors should have a thorough grasp of the nature of the job to be done overseas.
3. Selectors must have access to a comprehensive view of the total U.S. resources to do the job.
4. There must be instrumentalities (such as OES or university consortia) through which the resources of small institutions can be tapped.

F. AID Career Service

1. small permanent professional service;
2. lifetime career of service in the field of social, economic, and political development;
3. planners, managers, administrators, and organizers of governmentally assisted development activities;
4. compatible with the Foreign Service;
5. comparable policies and practices;
6. interchange personnel freely;

Foreign Development Reserve

1. a framework into which professionals of many kinds would fit for the purpose of temporary overseas service;
2. membership would carry a clear commitment to serve abroad;
3. provides a reservoir of trained and experienced people;
4. service would count in the overall career development of the individual.

F. Organization: Nongovernmental Arrangements

1. Functions performed by instrumentalities now in existence:
   - a. Combining the strength of several institutions;
   - b. Performing a function more readily performed by a centralized agency;
   - c. Tapping talent outside the leading institutions;
   - d. Lending university sponsorship and prestige to semi-autonomous operations;
2. Two cautions in regard to above functions
   - a. New instrumentalities should not be created to perform functions that could be performed as well by existing organizations.
   - b. It should be recognized that some inter-university ventures simply succeed in creating new entities that are completely outside the mainstream of university life.

G. Organization within AID

1. Establish new staff units to integrate human resource development strategies with broader programs of technical assistance and general economic development. To do this, the unit would have to perform the following specific functions:
   - a. Provide technical and professional staff assistance to the regional bureaus in formulating the educational and human resources components of country plans, recognizing that the primary responsibility for such country plans lies with the bureaus.
   - b. Participate with other staff organizations within AID in the formulation of general policies for U.S. technical assistance and economic aid, and in particular participate with the Program Coordination Staff in the formulation of long-range development strategies for particular countries.
   - c. Conduct, where necessary, feasibility studies and assessments of human resource development needs and priorities in particular areas or countries.

   d. Evaluate the effectiveness of all aid in the field of human resource and educational development; appraise research needs in the general area and conduct research as deemed necessary.

2. The unit must be equipped to deal with universities, foundations, research institutions, and other professional organizations. In this connection, it must perform the following functions:

   a. Provide technical and professional staff assistance to the regional bureaus in selecting contractors for projects identified within country programs, in conducting contract negotiations, and in handling subsequent relations with the contractors.

   b. Develop policies and provide policy guidance in AID's relations with universities and other nongovernmental groups; monitor those relations and serve as a clearinghouse for criticisms from either side; engage in continuous reappraisal of the relationships and recommend reforms; keep universities continuously informed of AID objectives, poliiies, programs, and needs; keep AID continuously informed of university requirements and problems; advise the administrator on matters relating to university relationships.

   c. Appraise institutional and trained manpower resources in the United States for overseas work in educational and human resources development; work with the universities and other nongovernmental groups to develop stronger institutional resources and a greater supply of trained manpower for such work.

   d. Engage in a continual effort to improve the matching of overseas needs and U.S. resources; seek new ways to tap U.S. institutional and trained manpower resources; and mobilize talent from all sources; explore the potentialities of the university consortium and the university-based development institute.

   e. Advise the administrator on matters relating to research; appraise research needs, conduct research, administer a program of research grants and contracts; evaluate technical assistance projects, both contractual and direct-hire.

   f. Maintain close liaison with related programs in the Department of State, Office of Education, Peace Corps, and other governmental, nongovernmental, and international agencies.

H. Semi-autonomous Governmental Institute

1. It is to be created in the reasonably near future.
2. It is to handle certain aspects of technical assistance particularly those aspects dealt with by the universities.
3. Factors that lead to this proposal:
    - a. The necessity that certain technical assistance activities be relieved of the pressures for early termination imposed by Congress and the public on other aspects of foreign aid. The long-term aspects of these activities should be emphasized, separate from the rest of foreign aid.

    - b. Combine maximum operating flexibility with full accountability to the government.
4. National Institute for Educational and Technical Corporation

    - a. NIETC is a separate corporate entity.
    - b. It has a separate board of trustees -- government and private.
    - c. NIETC has an independent budget..
    - d. It is ultimately responsible to the AID Administrator.
    - e. NIETC has its own career merit system.

5. Functions

    - a. Basic and applied research on the development process.
    - b. Grants and contracts to strengthen international capabilities of the universities;
    - c. Development of knowledge of manpower resources for overseas work in educational and human resource development;
    - d. To write contracts with universities and other organizations for long-term projects in educational and human resource development.

6. Distinctions between NIETC programs and AID regional bureau programs

    - a. There is a far heavier emphasis on research, analysis, and systematic experimentation in the development field.
    - b. There is a concern for the strengthening of U.S. universities.
    - c. There is a consistent preoccupation with the long-term goals of technical assistance.

7. Future Developments

    As the NIETC becomes increasingly concerned with continuing relationships with the developing countries, the Institute would become the focal point for a wide range of international educational programs not necessarily connected with development. The U.S. is also carrying on cultural, scientific, and educational relations with almost every country in the world. It might make sense, therefore, to consider an eventual merger of CU into the Institute.

20. THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION: A NEW INTERNATIONAL DIMENSION. 1964.

This report resulted from a nine-month study of the role of the Office of Education in the administration of Federal programs in international education in international responsibilities and the part the Office should play in defining and in meeting those needs.

Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, requested Education and World Affairs to examine the international dimension of the Office's activities to see where it could be rationalized and strengthened. The study was conducted by Richard Snyder, consultant to Education and World Affairs. A Study Committee, chaired by Herman B Wells and five members (John Fischer, John W. Gardner, William Greenbough, Devereux C. Josephs, and Francis H. Palmer) met several times between September 1963 and March 1964 to consider the problems of the study and to make recommendations.

Following are the major recommendations of the report:

1. Institutional Development

   The Office must play a larger part in defining needs for institutional development in the international area. This includes:

   a. estimating future demand for intellectual leaders and specialists;
   b. clarifying alternative goals for general education at all levels and developing better educational strategies for achieving those goals;
   c. assessing present accomplishments of American education by actual measurement of achievement;
   d. evaluating objectively the impact of programs designed to strengthen educational resources;
   e. appraising resources to make more efficient use of them.

2. International Research

   The Office should be given the necessary authority for a program of research support in the international field, which is comprehensive and adequate for future needs. The broadest possible criteria should be used to judge the relevance of international research to domestic education.

3. Comparative Education

   The Office should reexamine its in-house research program in comparative education to ensure a focus on activities which complement those of outside scholars. It should strongly emphasize its functions as an intellectual clearinghouse in this field.

4. **Educational Planning and National Growth**

The Office should give increased attention to research on educational planning and the relationships between education and national growth. It should maintain close liaison with international organizations and other centers of activity in this field and attempt to provide a link between these centers and planning authorities in the states.

5. **Foreign Educational Systems and Credentials**

The Office should reevaluate its activities in the interpretation of foreign educational credentials. Its efforts to disseminate up-to-date information about foreign educational credentials. Its efforts to disseminate up-to-date information about foreign educational systemd and institutions has been valuable and should be continued. It should curtail, and perhaps eliminate, its service in the evaluation of individual credentials.

6. **Information About American Education**

The Office should take all possible steps to ensure that information about American educational institutions is more effectively disseminated abroad in order to prevent wasteful duplication of our educational facilities, to protect the interests of foreign students, and to safeguard the international reputation of American education.

7. **International Capabilities of American Education**

The Office, as the agency with the most comprehensive concern for the health of American education, should be given broader and more flexible authority to strengthen international capabilities at all educational levels.

8. **Office of Education: The CU Committee**

A permanent Office-CU Committee should be established to dispose of disputed issues and deal with new issues as they arise. Priority topics should include:

a. Office participation in setting the policy for the planning of educational exchanges and related programs;
b. Office participation in activities of international organizations;
c. Representation of educational interests through United States embassies.

9. **Cooperation with AID**

The Office should withdraw from its present limited role in the administration of technical assistance activities on behalf of the Agency for International Development (AID).

The Office and AID should jointly consider whether the Office in other ways might make a more substantial professional contribution to international development.

Whether or not the Office participates in AID technical assistance operations, there must be closer cooperation to identify institutional needs and to strengthen education resources. A permanent Office-AID committee may be necessary but first the Office and AID should try to reach a more effective modus operandi.

10. Coordination of Federally Supported Research

The Office should take the initiative in developing a mechanism to coordinate the efforts of the many agencies and organizations engaged in federally supported research on educational and social shange.

11. Upgrading Professional Staff

All possible steps should be taken to upgrade the professional staff of the Office and to exchange ideas with the educational community. These steps should include:

a. adequate appropriations for salaries and expenses;
b. a larger allocation of "supergrades" under the Civil Service grade structure;
c. increased flexibility for the Commissioner of Education in filling top leadership positions within the Office;
d. initiation, in the reasonably near future, of a program of U.S. Office of Education Research Fellowships.

12. Continuing Review of Office Activities

The Commissioner should appoint a Panel of Consultants in Comparative Education with the responsibility for continuing review of Office activities in this field.

13. Office Reorganization

The Office structure should be reorganized. The Bureau of International Education, as it is presently constituted, should be abolished. A newly created Office of International Coordination should be established directly under the Commissioner of Education to take over the existing staff functions of the Bureau and develop both these functions indicated in this report and others that emerge in time. Operating functions of the present BIE should be allocated as appropriate to the remaining bureaus.

21. THE COLLEGE AND WORLD AFFAIRS. 1964.

This report of the Committee on the College and World Affairs (John W. Nason, chairman) primarily suggests ideas (such as faculty re-training, staffing with foreign faculty, encouraging foreign sutdents, and curriculum changes) to be carried out by a university alone, by a university in combination with others, or by a university with aid from private foundations.

It mentions the need for a coordinating agency for undergraduate foreign study without specific reference to the federal government.

Specific mention of the government is made, however, in the area of financing.

> "Support from foundations, corporations, the government, and individual donors will facilitate and improve the quality of resulting programs."

22. GOVERNMENTAL POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION: A SYMPOSIUM. 1965.

Edited by Stewart Fraser, this book consists of eighteen papers prepared by a team of distinguished researchers, educators, and diplomats for a symposium held at the International Center, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, October 22-24, 1964.

The main portion of the book focuses on the specific methods and motives of various national governments which have undertaken educational programs. The chapter on the United States is almost entirely explanatory and descriptive.

CHAPTER 2. "Criteria for Judging the Worth of an International Program," Harold R. W. Benjamin.

We have to be prudent and practical in exporting and importing educational aid. There are obviously boundaries which must be set in our attempts to move all the world ahead in education. Criteria for determining those boundaries under three main headings are:

PURPOSE

Importers come into a country with their wares and work to improve educational instruments, programs, and institutions without bothering the sensitive areas in which purposes reside. If we kept the purposes of aid in mind, there would be considerable reduction in the number of countries aided by the United States and an intensification of aid to countries which are solving their problems of purpose.

PROGRAM

Do the importing country's leaders, supported by substantial elements of the population, request skills and technical knowledge for educational reasons as contrasted, for example, to reasons of prestige or monetary aid?

PERSONNEL

This problem of upgrading personnel is best solved when attached cooperatively by the aided country and the outside agency. The method of furnishing the skills is very important. The potentially most fruitful of the above three areas for international trade in education is personnel.

23. Coombs, Philip H. "Ways to Improve United States Foreign Education Aid." EDUCATION AND FOREIGN AID. 1965.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Educational investment is a prerequisite to overall national development.
2. Educational development requires reform and innovation as well as quantitative expansion.
3. Educational planning is essential to the most effective use of educational resources.
4. Educational aid needs a strategy.
5. A greater research and development effort will raise the yield on educational investment.
6. Bilateral aid is more effective when integrated with multilateral aid.

SUGGESTIONS

The following are suggestions for improvement which could be undertaken promptly within existing legal and organizational framework.

1. Strengthening personnel
    a. Develop broad-gauge educational development strategists.
    b. AID should contract with universities to do this to include postgraduate "mid-career" programs.
2. Strengthening knowledge
    a. AID should underwrite a systematic inventory of pressing research needs, and a corresponding inventory of

available institutional capabilities for handling such research.
b. AID grants and contracts should be concerned with building strength into the research community.

3. Creating an educational aid strategy

a. This is not possible under the present fragmentation of the federal educational aid effort.
b. The bureaucracy must be presided over by someone with sufficient prestige, impartiality, and high-level support who can win confidence, respect, and cooperation of all interested parties. Probably the only existing group is the U.S. Advisory Commissiin on Educational and Cultural Affairs.
c. A continuing review should be made of the strategy.

4. Making fuller use of private capabilities

a. The bulk of private effort should be entirely independent of government influence and financial support.
b. An additional role of the private effort is to help government carry out its own policies and programs, i.e. through AID contracts.
c. A serious effort should be made to identify the nature and scope of available private potentialities and to consider practical ways and means for harnessing them.
d. A quasi-independent body (the U.S. International Education Foundation) should be created to absorb the many educational responsibiliities now handled by AID, Department of State, and the USIA. It would have wide operational autonomy, and yet would be responsive in its policies and peograms to the long-term needs of American foreign policy.

5. Strengthening multilateral effort

a. The United States should collaborate with the bilateral programs of other nations.
b. Utilize more fully the special capabilities of regional and international organizations.
c. A canvass should be made of specific possibilities for achieving greater collaboration. This should be followed by experimental efforts to explore these opportunities.

24. REPORTOF THE COMMITTEE ON CULTURE AND INTELLECTUAL EXCHANGE. 1965.

This report was prepared by the National Citizens' Commission on Intellectual Cooperation for the White House Conference on International Cooperation, Washington, D. C., November 28 to December 1, 1965.

The Committee members were Norman Cousins, Luther H. Evans, John F. White, Leslie Paffrath, Mrs. Emily Otis Barnes, David Hall, and Robert B. Hudson.

The Committee's recommendations are directed toward the need for the "reverse flow" idea --the rest of the world should have the opportunity to display its art and thought to Americans.

Recommendation 2

The principle of "reverse flow" governs all aspects of international activity on the part of the United States in the cultural and intellectual exchange field.

Recommendation 3

Special attention should be given to information coordination in this area through the combined media of (a) international conferences, (b) permanent secretariats, and (c) data processing facilities.

Recommendation 5

A semi-autonomous foundation be established to coordinate government-private sector collaboration abroad and to assist in funding activities throughout the cultural and intellectual exchange field.

Recommendation 6

There should be established an Institute for Advanced Study in the Arts, funded by the proposed foundation, which would assume the chief responsibilities in the areas of (a) exchange of persons, (b) special events, (c) information coordination as they pertain to the creative and performing arts.

Recommendation 7

There should be increased budgetary support through the proposed foundation for (a) the U.S. Committee on International Education and Public Affairs, (b) the U.S. Center of the International Theater Institute, and (c) the cultural program of UNESCO.

Recommendation 10

The position of the chief educational and cultural affairs officer in the State Department be elevated to an Under Secretaryship; and the administration of American cultural programs abroad be detached from service agencies whose principal or readily identifiable function is essentially political.

Recommendation 19

The Public Law 480 program, allowing for the procurement of foreign publications through non-convertible counterpart funds, should be expanded and intersified.

Recommendation 27

An international program should be established to bring university students and teachers of other countries to the United States to teach their native language in high schools and colleges, and to send out Americans to teach English in similar institutions abroad.

Recommendation 30

The President of the United States be requested to call an international conference on educational exchange, and that in arranging for such a conference means should be provided for a series of international planning meetings to determine the agenda and to develop an adequate conference program. Further, at such a conference means should be explored for the establishment of a permanent international secretariat for the continuing exchange of information and for the mutual planning of international educational exchange in the future.

Recommendation 31

Support should be given to the proposed establishment of a "Volunteers to America" or "Exchange Peace Corps" program under which the U.S. Peace Corps would bring foreign volunteers to serve in this country.

Recommendation 58

International training should be furthered among national guidance associations through the International Educational and Vocational Guidance Association.

Recommendation 59

A program be established for training nongovernmental women civic leaders, actual and potential, giving them the opportunity to benefit from the vast U.S. experience in the field of voluntary cooperative effort, especially needed in the newly emerging countries.

Recommendation 62

The President of the United States should be asked to use the prestige of his unique office through continued endorsement in word of the ideals and goals of International Cooperation Year, and by deed through taking the initiative in establishing a Presidential Medal of Merit in the Arts, Sciences, and the Humanities.

Recommendation 63

The Department of State should play a special role in the publicizing of international cooperation through more effective use of prominent figures in the arts in the role of "cultural ambassadors."

Recommendation 64

All channels of communication--private and governmental--should be involved in the effort to call public attention to International Cooperation Year--the reasons for it, its possibilities, and the part to be played by the private citizen in helping make international cooperation a continuing way of life extending through the next decade.

25. Johnson, Walter and Colligan, Francis J. THE FULBRIGHT PROGRAM: A HISTORY. 1965.

This account traces the program from the Fulbright Act of 1946 to its endorsement by Congress as a pernament feature of U.S. foreign policy in the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1961 explaining how certain policies and procedures came about.

On cooperation of governmental and non-governmental groups in the field of international education (pp. 324-325)

> "As John D. Rockefeller III suggested in 1964 to philanthropic organizations that they 'turn over to government a greater share of the burden of support of the tried and proven, so that they may be enabled to push forward philanthrophy's frontiers', we realize that both can be motivated by common goals and purposes. Without sacrificing such invaluable components as initiative and spontaneity among our people, it may be possible to coordinate such activities somewhat more closely, as Rockefeller has pointed out."

26. Frankel, Charles THE NEGLECTED ASPECT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS: AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL POLICY ABROAD. 1966

This study was completed prior to Dr. Frankel's appointment as Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State. The objectives of the study were to (1) reexamine the purposes that govern U.S. Government exchange programs, (2) describe present institutional arrangements for achieving those objectives, (3) appraise those practices, and (4) suggest possible improvements for the future.

Three basic reforms to which the recommendations are directed:

1. Upgrade educational and cultural relations.

   They should be raised to a level of authority consonant with their significance to the relations of the U.S. with other nations.

2. Create a new environment for educational and cultural affairs.

   A particular problem which needs to be changed is the administrative setting.

3. There needs to be a more effective relationship between government and the private educational and cultural communities.

   The educational, scholarly, and artistic worlds have to be drawn into educational and cultural activities at the initial level at which policy and plans are formed. In line with this, new and more cooperative and binding relationships should be developed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Improve the position of the cultural affairs officer.

   1. Raise CAO's status within the Embassy, and make the position an attractive career prospect.

   2. Clarify the CAO's tasks with less emphasis on administrative and public relations tasks.

   3. Extend the CAO's responsibilities, so that he is concerned with among other things, AID education programs, NDEA grants, NSF projects, etc.

   4. Institute a more flexible approach to recruitment of CAO's.

B. Reallocation of existing responsibilities

   1. Lodge the central responsibility for educational and cultural affairs in the Department of State. USIA mission objectives are out of keeping with those of educational and cultural affairs, and AID's interest is too specialized and technically project-oriented. In line with this recommendation, Dr. Frankel would reinforce the independence of CU, and give the Board of Foreign Scholarships an independent staff.

   2. Create an Under Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs. As a continuing aspect of foreign relations, educational and cultural affairs should be given the same importance within the Department as is now accorded to political and economic affairs. Dr. Frankel says, parenthetically, that if the Office

of Education were raised to cabinet status, it might be more proper to locate educational and cultural affairs there.

C. Reorganize educational and cultural exchange

1. Create a semi-autonomous foundation for educational and cultural exchange. These exchange programs have only a peripheral relationship to the Department of State's most pressing concerns. Thus, there might be a mix of government and private funds to support a foundation, for which the Smithsonian is a prototype. The foundation would be staffed by a core-group of career officals. A proportion of its representatives in the field as well as in Washington would belong to the permanent staff. It would also have a reserve staff alternating between public service and periods of work in private educational or cultural institutions. The representative of the foundation in the Embassy would operate with considerable autonomy, as is the case with Peace Corps representatives. It would free the CAO so he could serve as cultural reporter, analyst, and liaison man.

2. The Federal Government should play an important role in educational and cultural affairs. It is peculiarly capable of providing the leadership, and of stimulating the movement toward coordination and planning, which American educational and cultural affairs so badly need.

27. "International Education and Health." 1966.

In a special message to Congress on February 2, 1966, President Johnson outlined a broad program for action in the field of international education, which embodied numerous recommendations. Many of these were incorporated in the International Education Act of 1966.

In the message, President Johnson proposed "to strengthen our capacity for international education al cooperation; to stimulate exchange with students and teachers of other lands; to assist the progress of education in developing nations; to build new bridges of international understanding."

I. Strengthen our capacity for international educational cooperation.

A. Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish within his Department a Center for Educational Cooperation.

1. To act as a channel for communication between our missions abroad and the U.S. educational community.

2. To direct programs assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

3. To assist public and private agencies conducting international education programs.

B. Appoint a Council on International Education.

1. Composed of outstanding leaders of American education, business, labor, the professions, and philanthropy;

2. To advise the Center for Educational Cooperation.

C. Create a Corps of Education Officers to serve in the U.S. Foreign Service.

1. Recruited from the ranks of outstanding educators;

2. Report directly to the ambassador when serving in foreign missions.

D. Stimulate new programs in international studies for elementary and secondary schools.

E. Support programs of international scope in smaller and developing colleges.

F. Strengthen centers of special competence in international research and training.

1. Promote centers of excellence in dealing with particular problems and particular regions of the world.

2. Develop administrative staff and faculties adequate to maintain long-term commitments to overseas educational enterprises.

3. Give AID authority to provide support to American research and educational institutions, for increasing their capacity to deal with programs of economic and social development abroad.

II. Stimulate exchange with the students and teachers of other lands.

A. Encourage the growth of school-to-school partnerships.

1. Assist in construction, exchange books and equipment, teacher and student visits.

2. It is to be administrated by Peace Corps. in cooperation with AID.

3. The chief cost will be borne by voluntary contributions of the participating schools.

B. Establish an Exchange Peace Corps.

1. "Volunteers to America" would teach their own language and culture in American schools.

2. The Corps would serve in community programs alongside VISTA volunteers.

3. It will be helped to gain training to prepare them for further service when they return home.

C. Establish an American Education Placement Service.

1. International recruitment bureau for American teachers.

2. Provide supplemental assistance for those going to areas of special hardship.

III. Assist the progress of education in developing nations.

A. Enlarge AID programs of education assistance.

1. Emphasize teacher training, vocational and scientific education, construction of educational facilities, specialized training in the U.S. for foreign students, and help in publishing badly needed textbooks.

B. Develop new techniques for teaching basic education and fighting illiteracy.

1. Modern technology and new communications techniques have the power to multiply the resources available to a school system.

2. Support basic education research of value to the developing nations. (HEW)

3. Conduct studies and assist pilot projects for applying technology to meet critical education shortages.(AID)

C. Expand U.S. Summer Teaching Corps.

1. For American teachers and professors who participate in summer workshops in less developed countries.

2. To serve to support teacher training in these countries.

D. Assist the teaching of English abroad.

1. English is a language of international communication and national development:

E. Establish binational educational foundations.

1. Could be supported by foreign currencies;

2. Governed by leading citizens from the two nations;

3. Would invest in basic educational development.

IV. Build new bridges of international understanding.

A. Stimulate conferences of leaders and experts.

B. Increase the flow of books and other educational material.

    1. Recommend passage of legislation to implement the Florence agreement.

    2. Recommend that Congress implement the Beirut agreement to permit duty-free entry of visual and auditory materials.

    3. Encourage private American enterprise to participate actively in educational exchange.

C. Improve the quality of U.S. schools and colleges abroad.

    1. Should be showcases for excellence in education.

    2. Should make overseas service attractive to U.S. citizens.

    3. Should provide close contact with students and teachers of the host country.

D. Create special programs for future leaders studying in the U.S.

    1. HEW and AID should provide grants to enrich their educational experience through special courses and summer institutes.

28. Michie, Allan A., editor. DIVERSITY AND INTERDEPENDENCE THROUGH INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION. 1967.

This book is the edited account of what was said at the symposium which met on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Fulbright Act. The purpose of the meeting was both to place the Fulbright program in the perspective it has assumed over the years in the field of international education, and to explore future directions which international programs should take.

According to Charles Frankel, one of the participants in the symposium, there would be educational and cultural relations between our nation and others even without the assistance of the State Department. At the same time, the government does have a definite role to play; it must supplement and direct the natural exchange between nations, and it must supplement and/or correct "distorted" or "superficial" communications, "unnecessary superstitions, stereotypes, misconceptions that are encouraged and spread abroad by the immense flow of modern communications."

Mr. Frankel also felt that the government should be behind efforts in international education, but that the best program was that which involved the government the least. He felt that it would be better for the government to help universities become able to handle the programs independently, and for them to make international education a "normal matter of university life, not a sabbatical year affair".

Caryl P. Haskins brought up discussion of the need for government encouragement in the field of science, and pointed to certain features of the International Education Act as being particularly useful in bringing about scientific revolutions in other countries. Among them were: 1) the opportunity for establishment of binational foundations; 2) the expansion of school-to-school partnerships overseas; 3) the establishment of Educational Officers in our embassies; and 4) the liberalization of provision of visas for overseas scientific visitors attending meetings in this country.

Michael Rabin spoke of the importance to science of establishing international universities, such as CERN in Geneva. He suggested that one of the outstanding U.S. or European universities might be declared international for a year or two, and might thereby serve as a place for scientists and scholars to converge.

In his concluding remarks, Charles Frankel brought up the need for improvement in government activities in the field of international education, with special emphasis on the need for coordination of federal programs, most of which grew up as "afterthoughts". He called for the adoption of certain basic guidelines by the various government agencies to ensure against the possibility of their appearing to represent conflicting philosophies. Federal agencies should agree that:

1. all forms of overseas educational activity are cultural encounters;
2. educational problems require educational perspectives;
3. we must get good people and reach others where they are;
4. we must get institutions involved;
5. we must strengthen U.S. resources by giving a better education to Americans in this country;
6. we must better communications between various agencies in embassies overseas;
7. we must have a steady critique by educators of what is being done.

29. STUDY OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION. 1968.

House Resolution No. 614 directed the Special Subcommittee on Education to make "a complete evaluation and study of the operations of the U.S. Office of Education." Such a study was considered appropriate and necessary in light of the numerous pieces of education legislation that had been enacted starting with the 88th Congress. The following recommendations are those which pertain to the international activities of the office.

Division of Foreign Studies

1. That the Center for Educational Cooperation provide more publicity and informational services to the potential users of its programs -- especially to the elementary-secondary education segment (on the programs for which that segment is eligible).

2. That close consideration be given to a further centralization of OE-DHEW international education programs within the Center for Educational Cooperation.

3. That the Center for Educational Cooperation-- by development of its own capability, through the National Center for Educational Statistics, or by contract-- meet the need of Congress and the public for timely and detailed evaluation of its programs, and especially those under title VI of NDEA.

Note: These recommendations were made at a time when plans were being drawn up to locate a Center for Educational Cooperation under the Assistant Secretary for Education. Once operative, the Center was to administer the programs authorized by the International Education Act of 1966, and it was planned that the Division of Foreign Studies would be maintained intact as a Division of the Center.

The subcommittee strongly approved of the establishment of the Center, particularly as a means of correcting the fragmented administrative pattern surrounding the foreign studies programs supported by the Federal government.

30. FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS. 1968.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Quasi-Public Mechanism

In order to maintain the integrity of the educational and cultural exchange programs of the U.S. Government, the Commission urges the establishment of a separate public-private entity to assume complete responsibility for these programs, which are now handled by several government agencies.

This mechanism might combine the functions of the Center for Educational Cooperation, which is to be established in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education, the functions of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State, and the genuine educational and cultural aspects of the United States Information Agency, such as its libraries and English language teaching programs.

B. Education Officers

The Commission calls upon the Congress to reconsider its position on the establishment of a corps of education officers.

C. Funding Crisis

The Commission calls upon the Congress to appropriate funds to put into effect the International Education Act of 1966.

Until the recommendation on establishment of a quasi-public mechanism is carried out, the Commission urges the Executive branch and Congress to increase the budget of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State.

DIRECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Federal Programs in Education Designed to Improve International Understanding and Cooperation

Contractor:
Education and World Affairs
522 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10036
William W. Marvel, President
(Project Director)

Contract Number: OEC-0-8-080859-4409(014)
Project Number: 8-0859
Contract Amount: $35,000
Contract Period: June 1968 to March 1969

The central focus of the report is on the changes, adjustments, and consolidation necessary to achieve our national goals through international education more efficiently and expeditiously. The report indicates that new arrangements are necessary: 1) to define the basis for evaluating the federal government's efforts in international education; 2) to achieve greater efficiency in the use of high-level manpower and funds; 3) to assure close agency linkage, interpenetration, and reinforcement between domestic and overseas aspects of international education; 4) to highlight the relevance of international education to the urgent domestic problems of American society; and 5) to take account of sensitivities of peoples in less advanced countries.

The recommendations in the report are presented as sets of options, rather than as series of explicit proposals. The Office of Education(OE) is viewed as the pivitol agency from the standpoint of planning in international education and should become the nation's "focal point of leadership" in that area. OE should be strengthened to function as the center of consolidation for various federal activities in international education, including those of the Departments of HEW, State and Defense, the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency and the Military Security Agencies. The options are based on such an expanded role for OE:

Option 1: Concentrate on improvement of individual federal programs in international education without any significant relocation of activities or establishment of new institutional arrangements.

Option 2: Undertake the moves embodied in Option 1 and, in addition, give concerted support to the strategy already embodied in the new Institute of International Studies for Office-of-Education-wide attention to international education, by using as many of the existing legislative authorities as possible.

Option 3: Further strengthen the Office of Education so that it becomes not only a "focal point of leadership" for federal activities in international education, but also a base to which certain highly relevant programs and functions could be transferred.

Giving attention to the longer run, the report recommends greater interagency coordination to maintain balance of effort in international education, to avoid agency duplication and conflict in direction, and to achieve a reasonable level of coherence. The locus for coordination might rest in the office of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, provided that the requisite commitment and orientation can be assured. The report also gives consideration to the establishment of a new public-private agency to provide a rallying point supporter and stimulator for the voluntary agencies in international affairs.